arXiv:1302.2399v1 [math.NT] 11 Feb 2013

Spectral Theory for p-adic Banach Representations and p-adic Quantum Theory

University of Tokyo, Tomoki Mihara

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Basic Notions **8**

3 Three Reductions **19**

4 Functional Calculus and Unitary Diagonalisability **22**

5 Reductively Infinite Operator **32**

6 Reductively Finite Operator **35**

7 Unbounded Normal Operator **53**

8 Appendix **61**

Acknowledgements **70**

References **70**

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, denote by $p \in \mathbb{N}$ the characteristic of the residue field, Definition 2.30 and Definition 3.1, of the base field k. The p-adic analysis sometimes appears in the modern physics. For example, the adelic analysis is essential in Feynman's adelic path integral. People are usually accustomed to the Euclidean geometry because our world is somehow built on a topological space locally isomorphic to an affine space $\mathbb{R}^n$, but there is no reason one has to restrict all topologies which arise in physics to the Archimedean ones. A physical quantity T_1 might just be the real part of some complex physical quantity $T_1 + iT_2$, and the imaginary part T_2 might affect other physical quantity even though there is no method to observe it. The same might be true for an adelic number. There might be a physical quantity which takes values $a = (a_\infty, a_2, a_3, a_5, \cdots, a_p, \cdots)$ in the adele

$$\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}} := \left\{ a \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Q}_2 \times \mathbb{Q}_3 \times \mathbb{Q}_5 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Q}_p \times \cdots \ \middle| \ \# \left\{ p \in \mathbb{N} \ \middle| \ p \text{ is prime}, |a_p|_p > 1 \right\} < \infty \right\}$$

and only whose real entry $a_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$ people can observe. In particular in Quantum Mechanics, an ideal observation always acts on the observee, and it forces to change the physical state from the previous one according to the projection postulate. Therefore the fact that people can only observe real-valued ones does not justify the assumption of the reality of all physical quantities. Thus the p-adic analogue of theories in physics itself is significant, and constructions of p-adic models of mechanics are meaningful. We will give one of the explicit formulations of the p-adic Quantum theory in Definition 4.30, Definition 4.31, Definition 4.34, and Definition 7.24.

Now in the Schrödinger picture of the ordinary (Archimedean) Quantum theory, physical states and observables are presented as state vectors in a Hilbert space evolving in time and constant self-adjoint operators on it. In finite dimensional cases, a self-adjoint operator and a normal operator corresponds to a Hermitian matrix and a normal matrix. The reason an observable should be presented by a self-adjoint operator rather than a general operator in a wider class is very simple. A closable operator T admits the spectral measure dE_T which gives the spectral decomposition

$$T = \int_{\sigma(T)} \lambda dE_T(\lambda)$$

if and only if it is normal, and a normal operator has real-valued spectrum if and only if it is self-adjoint. In finite dimensional cases, these properties are translated as the diagonalisability of a normal matrix by a unitary matrix and the reality of the eigenvalues of a Hermitian matrix. An eigenvector of a fixed observable is an eigenstate, namely, a vector state in which the observed value of it is determined, and the diagonalisability by a unitary matrix guarantees that a vector state can be uniquely presented as a linear combination of normalised orthogonal eigenstates. Thus the self-adjointness indicates the reality of observed values of an observable, the principle of the quantum superposition, and Born rule.

On the other hand, consider the non-Archimedean analogue of Quantum theory. There seems to be no canonical involution on the non-Archimedean base field k. Why not? An involution has a strong relation with a formally real field such as hyperreal field in the non-standard analysis, but a p-adic field is never formally real. The non-Archimedean property of an order and the non-Archimedean valuation conflict in the mixed characteristic case. To tell the truth, there is a non-Archimedean ordered non-Archimedean valued field with non-mixed characteristic $(0, 0)$ such as Levi-Civita field, which is a formally real extension of the real Puiseux series field in the Archimedean Novikov field, but it is not useful for "p-adic" model of Quantum theory.

By the absence of a canonical involution, there is no corresponding notions of reality and positivity work. In particular, a symmetric inner product on a k-vector space does not gives a norm in general. Example 8.1 in Appendix might help a reader to understand what happens. Note that we do not mean that a symmetric inner product on a vector space never gives a norm, and indeed, in rare cases such phenomena occur. There is an example in Appendix. See Proposition 8.2. Such a construction of an inner product which generates a norm does not work in the case of higher dimensional k-Banach spaces than 4 when k is a local field, and hence in particular the p-adic Hilbert space

$$\mathscr{L}^2(I,k,\omega) \coloneqq \left\{ f \coloneqq (f_i)_{i\in I} \in k^I \;\middle|\; \lim_{i\in I} \left|\omega_i f_i^2\right| = 0 \right\}$$

associated to a countable index set I and a weight $\omega = (\omega_i)_{i\in I} \in k^I$ is equipped with the canonical norm

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \|\cdot\|_\omega \colon \mathscr{L}^2(I,k,\omega) & \to & [0,\infty) \\ f & \mapsto & \|f\|_\omega \coloneqq \sup_{i\in I} \left|\omega_i f_i^2\right| \end{array}$$

and the canonical symmetric inner product

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \langle \cdot \mid \cdot \rangle_\omega \colon \mathscr{L}^2(I,k,\omega) \otimes_k \mathscr{L}^2(I,k,\omega) & \to & k \\ f \otimes g & \mapsto & \langle f \mid g \rangle_\omega \coloneqq \sum_{i\in I} \omega_i f_i g_i \end{array}$$

which are not compatible if $\# I > 4$. Therefore it is doubtful that the analogue of Born rule

$$\mathscr{P}_{|\,\psi\,\rangle}(A \in U) = \sum_{\lambda\in U} |\langle\, \psi \mid P_A(\lambda) \mid \psi\,\rangle| = \sum_{\lambda\in U} \|P_A(\lambda)\psi\|^2 = \left\|\sum_{\lambda\in U} P_A(\lambda)\psi\right\|^2 \in [0,\infty)$$

of an Archimedean observable A with discrete intersection $U \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{C}}(V)}(A) \subset \mathbb{R}$ surely makes sense in the model of p-adic Quantum theory in p-adic Hilbert space. The analogous equalities

$$\mathscr{P}_{|\,\psi\,\rangle}(A \in U) = \begin{cases} \sum_{\lambda\in U} \langle\, \psi \mid P_A(\lambda) \mid \psi\,\rangle & \in k \\ \sum_{\lambda\in U} |\langle\, \psi \mid P_A(\lambda) \mid \psi\,\rangle| & \in [0,\infty) \\ \left|\sum_{\lambda\in U} \langle\, \psi \mid P_A(\lambda) \mid \psi\,\rangle\right| & \in [0,\infty) \\ \sum_{\lambda\in U} \|P_A(\lambda)\psi\| & \in [0,\infty) \\ \sum_{\lambda\in U} \|P_A(\lambda)\psi\|^2 & \in [0,\infty) \\ \max_{\lambda\in U} \|P_A(\lambda)\psi\| & \in [0,\infty) \\ \left\|\sum_{\lambda\in U} P_A(\lambda)\psi\right\|^2 & \in [0,\infty) \end{cases}$$

for a non-Archimedean operator A with discrete intersection $U \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{B}_k(V)}(A) \subset k$ have distinct meanings and totally differ from each other. Furthermore when one considers the case of continuous spectrum, he or she has to puzzle over what kind of p-adic integrations works well. Haar measure, p-adic Mazur measure, Coleman integral, Shnirel'man integral, p-adic Mahler measure, or some other p-adic integration or measure such as a p-adic L-function?

Moreover, the absence of the canonical involution causes the difficulty of defining the normality or the self-adjointness of an operator. What kind of an operator should one deal with as a non-Archimedean normal operator? Or in the first place is there a reasonable justification for the assumption that a non-Archimedean physical quantity is presented as an operator on a non-Archimedean Hilbert space? Remark that the parallelo gram law

$$\|f+g\|+\|f-g\|=2(\|f\|+\|g\|)$$

never holds for a non-trivial non-Archimedean Banach space, and the law of cosines

$$|\langle f \mid g \rangle| = \left|\|f\|+\|g\|-\|f+g\|\right|$$

does not work for a non-trivial non-Archimedean inner product space. As we have already shown, non-Archimedean Hilbert spaces are far from Archimedean Hilbert spaces. However, a non-Archimedean Banach space is more similar with the underlying Archimedean Banach space of an Archimedean Hilbert space than a general Archimedean Banach space in some aspect. There is a good class of non-Archimedean Banach spaces, namely, the class of strictly Cartesian Banach spaces, Definition 2.56. A strictly Cartesian Banach space is a non-Archimedean Banach space admitting an orthonormal Schauder basis, Definition 2.55. Furthermore, an isometric automorphism on a non-Archimedean Banach space works as a unitary transformation on an Archimedean Hilbert space. We will simply define a non-Archimedean unitary operator as an isometric automorphism in §4. Note that a strictly Cartesian Banach space is non-canonically isometric to the Banach space of the form $\mathrm{C}_0(I,k)$ for some countable discrete topological space I by definition, and identifying $\mathrm{C}_0(I,k)$ and $\mathscr{L}^2(I,k,1)$, it admits a non-canonical inner product. We will no longer see such an inner product and will forget a structure of a Hilbert space.

Once one has defined the unitarity of an operator, the normality will be soon formulated. Consider the finite dimensional case first. A unitary matrix is a matrix whose natural representation is a unitary operator with respect to the canonical norm associated to the canonical basis. One does not have to take care of the absence of the canonical involution now. The non-Archimedean counterpart of the normality of a matrix in the finite dimensional case is the diagonalisability by a unitary matrix. A value of a non-Archimedean physical quantity does not have to be “real”, and instead one might assume the spectrum of the corresponding operator is contained in the base field k. We call such an operator a k-valued operator. Recall that a Hermitian matrix has a Jordan normal form concentrated at the diagonal with real-valued entries, i.e. with entries invariant under the action of the absolute Galois group $\{\mathrm{id}, *\}$ of $\mathbb{R}$. Similarly a k-valued normal matrix has a Jordan normal form concentrated at the diagonal with k-valued entries, i.e. with G-invariant entries, where G is the absolute Galois group of k. A self-adjoint operator on an Archimedean Hilbert space corresponds to a k-valued normal operator on a non-Archimedean Banach space. Thus one might not stick to construct a p-adic model of the Quantum theory on a p-adic Hilbert space. A strictly Cartesian p-adic Banach space might sufficiently stand in for it. A p-adic physical quantity is presented as a k-valued normal matrix in the finite dimensional case.

Now consider the infinite dimensional case. How should the normality of a non-Archimedean operator $A \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ on a p-adic Banach space V be defined without using an involution? In the Archimedean Quantum theory again, observables are presented as an Archimedean self-adjoint operator on an Archimedean Hilbert space. The normality of an Archimedean operator $A \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{C}}(V)$ on an Archimedean Hilbert space V guarantees the existence of the spectral measure dE_A on the spectrum $\sigma_{\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{C}}(V)}(A)$ of A which gives the spectral decomposition of the observable. Suppose A is bounded and hence its spectrum is compact for convenience. The spectral measure induces the continuous functional calculus

$$\iota_A \colon \mathrm{C}(\sigma_{\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{C}}(V)}(A), \mathbb{C}) \to \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{C}}(V),$$

namely, the unique isometric $\mathbb{C}$-algebra isomorphism sending the coordinate function $z \colon \sigma_{\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{C}}(V)}(A) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ to the operator A. We extract this property, and hence we define the normality of an operator on a p-adic Banach space as the existence of the continuous functional calculus. A p-adic physical quantity is a k-valued normal operator on a strictly Cartesian p-adic Banach space, Definition 4.31 and Definition 7.24.

One has to consider how to justify the continuous functional calculus, namely, the substitution of an operator to a continuous function. One of the most basic method is the use of the spectral measure. Note that the proof of the existence of the spectral measure of an Archimedean normal operator heavily relies on the real and complex analysis: for example, the regularity of the resolvent operator, the harmonic analysis, the Stieltjes integral of a bounded variation function, the existence of a monotonously increasing sequence of continuous functions pointwise converging to a characteristic function, Riesz representation theorem, and so on. These basic analysis rely on the fundamental properties of the topology of the real line: for example, the existences of the notions of convexity, positivity, arcwise-connectedness, and so on. To tell the truth, a formulation of the spectral decomposition of a bounded analytic operator with compact spectrum has been already given by Vishik in his paper, [Vis], but it just yields kind of the holomorphic functional calculus analogous to Riesz functional calculus. Can the assumption that an operator is analytic and has compact spectrum be removed? Can it be extended to the continuous functional calculus? How about extending it to that of an unbounded operator? They are a little complicated. The functional calculus in his work uses Shnirel'man integral, which is a non-Archimedean analogue of Cauchy integral of an analytic function introduced in [Shn], and the assumption that an operator is analytic and has compact spectrum is heavily important there. The assummption of the boundedness is also essential there, because a non-Archimedean Banach space is not necessarily reflective. The reason why the spectral measure works well in the continuous functional calculus in the Archimedean case is because an Archimedean Hilbert space is reflective. The equality

$$h(f(A)g) = \int_{\sigma(A)} f(\lambda) d(h(E_A(\lambda)g)) \in k$$

for each $g \in A$ and $h \in V^{\vee}$ might determine an operator $f(A)$ on $V^{\vee\vee}$, but it is difficult to calculate the domain of it when its codomain is restricted on the weakly dense subspace $V \subset V^{\vee\vee}$. When A is densely defined, is $f(A)$ also densely defined after the restriction? Remark that an infinite dimensional strictly Cartesian Banach space is not reflective because the natural multiplication $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(I,k) \otimes_k \mathrm{C}_0(I,k) \to \mathrm{C}_0(I,k)$ for a countably infinite index set I gives the inclusions $\mathrm{C}_0(I,k) \subset \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(I,k) \subset \mathrm{C}_0(I,k)^{\vee}$, the first inclusion of which is obviously not surjective. Note that assigning some suitable conditions to an operator, there is an extension of the result of Vishik by Dodzi Attimu and Toka Diagana in [AD], but the aim of their works is different from mine. One of the aims of my work is the formulation of the continuous functional calculus, and therefore we construct the spectral theory with another method than the use of Vishik's spectral measure.

Be careful that the term "continuous functional calculus" is a little ambiguous in the non-Archimedean situation in the following sense: To begin with in the Archimedean case, the spectrum σ of a bounded operator is a bounded closed subset of the locally compact metric space $\mathbb{C}$, and hence is compact. Therefore the rings $\mathrm{C}_0(\sigma,\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma,\mathbb{C}) \subset \mathrm{C}(\sigma,\mathbb{C})$ coincide with each other. On the other hand in the non-Archimedean case, the spectrum σ of a k-valued bounded operator is a bounded closed subset of the complete ultrametric space k which is not necessarily locally compact, and hence is not compact in general. Therefore the rings $\mathrm{C}_0(\sigma,k) \subset \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma,k) \subset \mathrm{C}(\sigma,k)$ may differ from each other. The ambiguity occurs in the choice of the ring for the domain of the continuous functional calculus. Which one is suitable domain for the p-adic continuous functional calculus? The first ring $\mathrm{C}_0(\sigma,k)$ is a non-unital Banach k-algebra, but does not contains the coordinate function $z\colon \sigma \hookrightarrow k$ when σ is non-compact. The second ring $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma,k)$ is a Banach k-algebra contains the coordinate function z but is so large that the localisation of $k[z] \subset \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma,k)$ by functions in $k[z] \cap \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma,k)^{\times}$ is not dense in general. The third ring $\mathrm{C}(\sigma,k)$ is too large and does not admits a canonical norm compatible with the supremum norm of $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma,k)$. The density of the localisation of $k[z]$ is essential for the uniqueness of the continuous functional calculus, and hence we will use the other appropriate closed k-subalgebra densely containing $k[z]$, namely, the closure $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma,k)$ of the localisation of $k[z]$ in $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma,k)$. The continuous functional calculus for an unbounded non-Archimedean operator is still more complicated because a unbounded closed subset of k is not σ-compact, while an unbounded closed subset of $\mathbb{C}$ is countable at infinity. Remark that the self-adjointness of an Archimedean operator guarantees the existence of the Borel functional calculus, which is stronger than the continuous functional calculus of a normal operator, but we do not use this property for the definition of a p-adic observable because there is few differences between the class of p-adic Borel-measurable functions and the class of p-adic continuous functions. Recall that a non-Archimedean field is totally disconnected and hence the ring of p-adic continuous functions on a topological space, which one may assume is totally disconnected and compact Hausdorff by Proposition 2.46, possesses enough projections. Thus a non-Archimedean commutative C^*-algebra, where we mean a commutative uniform Banach k-algebra isometrically isomorphic to the ring of continuous functions on a totally disconnected compact Hausdorff space, is much similar with an Archimedean commutative von Neumann algebra than an Archimedean commutative C*-algebra. See examples and propositions in §2 such as Example 2.36 for the properties of non-Archimedean commutative C*-algebras.

The main themes of this paper is to establish the sufficient conditions for the normality of a p-adic bounded operator, and is to give an explicit definition of the normality of a p-adic unbouded operator. We will observe the necessary conditions for the normality in Proposition 4.22, Proposition 4.38, and Proposition 6.19, relating to the normal reduction, Definition 3.1. We will add some algorithmic condition to them, and then will obtain our main results, Theorem 5.2, Theorem 6.7, and Theorem 6.22. Now we finish the introduction showing the common features and the differences of the normalities of an Archimedean operator and a non-Archimedean operator. We prepared various specific examples for them in §8, Appendix.

In the Archimedean case, the most basic examples of normal operators are a self-adjoint operator, a skew-self-adjoint operator, and a unitary operator. Conversely since the involution is diagonalisable, a normal operator is uniquely decomposed into the sum $T + S$ of two commuting operators one of whom is a self-adjoint operator T and the other one of whom is a skew-self-adjoint operator S, and a skew-self-adjoint operator S is presented as an operator of the form iT' by the unique self-adjoint operator T'. Therefore self-adjoint operators are one of the most essential class of normal operators, and let us think about non-Archimedean counterparts of Hermitian matrix first. Recall that a real symmetric matrix is a complex Hermitian matrix, and hence the simplest alternative might be a p-adic symmetric matrix. However, we have an example of a p-adic symmetric matrix which is not diagonalisable. See Proposition 8.3.

There is another non-Archimedean analogous notion of a Hermitian matrix. The diagonalisability of an Archimedean normal matrix is easily verified by calculating the canonical inner products of its eigenvectors, because the adjoint property of the involution with respect to the inner product directly implies the complete reducibility of the linear representation by it. Similarly, if a non-Archimedean vector space has a good inner product, the adjoint property determines an involution. An invariant matrix of the non-Archimedean non-canonical involution behaves like a Hermitian matrix, and is diagonalisable by a unitary matrix in many cases. See Definition 8.4, Proposition 8.5, Definition 8.6, and Proposition 8.7. The last one gives the direct application to the p-adic Pauli matrices.

Example 1.1. *Suppose $p \equiv 3$ [mod.4] and $\widetilde{k} = \mathbb{F}_p$. Let K/k be the unramified Galois extension $k[X]/(X^2+1)$ and $i \in K$ the image of $X \in k[X]$ the canonical projection $k[X] \to K$. Set*

$$\sigma_x := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \sigma_y := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \sigma_z := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \in M_2(K)$$

and call them the p-adic counterparts of the Pauli matrices. Then the p-adic Pauli matrices are diagonalisable by distinct unitary matrices in K.

Note that even if $p \equiv 1$ [mod.4], the p-adic Pauli matrices are defined in the same way replacing K by k itself and fixing a square root i of -1 in k, and are diagonalisable by distinct unitary matrices in k. However if $p = 2$, obviously the p-adic Pauli matrices do not work.

2 Basic Notions

Definition 2.1. *Let G be an Abelian group. A seminorm on G is a set-theoretical map* $\| \cdot \| \colon G \to [0, \infty) \colon a \mapsto \|a\|$ *satisfying the following:*

(i) $\|0\| = 0$*; and*

(ii) $\|a - b\| \leq \|a\| + \|b\|$ *for any* $a, b \in \mathscr{A}$*.*

A seminorm gives G a structure of a pseudo-metric space with respect to which G is a topological group in a natural way. A seminorm is said to be a norm if it satisfies the additional condition

(i)' $\|a\| = 0$ *if and only if* $a = 0$*,*

which is stronger than (*i*)*. A norm gives G a structure of a metric space. A seminorm is said to be non-Archimedean if it satisfies the additional condition*

(ii)' $\|a - b\| \leq \max\{\|a\|, \|b\|\}$ *for any* $a, b \in \mathscr{A}$*,*

which is stronger than the condition (ii). A non-Archimedean norm gives G a structure of an ultrametric space.

In fact one did not have to assume that the underlying group G is Abelian. The reason why we assumed this is because we always consider the case that G is the underlying additive group of a ring.

Example 2.2. *Let G be an Abelian group. The trivial norm on G is the norm* $\| \cdot \| \colon G \to [0, \infty)$ *determined by the additional condition*

(i)" $\|a\| = 1$ *for any non-zero element* $a \in \mathscr{A}$ *and* $\|0\| = 0$*,*

which is stronger than the conditions (i) and (ii). The trivial norm is one of the most important example of non-Archimedean norms.

Definition 2.3. *A seminormed Abelian group is data* $(G, \| \cdot \|)$ *of an Abelian group G with a fixed seminorm* $\| \cdot \| \colon G \to [0, \infty)$*. The Abelian group G and the seminorm* $\| \cdot \|$ *are called the underlying group and the seminorm of* $(G, \| \cdot \|)$*. We usually write G instead of* $(G, \| \cdot \|)$ *for short. A seminormed Abelian group is said to be a normed Abelian group (or non-Archimedean) if its seminorm is a norm (resp. non-Archimedean). For a normed Abelian group, endow its underlying group with the metric topology given by the norm. A normed Abelian group is said to be complete if its underlying metric space is complete.*

Definition 2.4. *Let* $(G, \|\cdot\|)$ *be a seminormed Abelian group. For a positive real number* $r > 0$*, set*

$$G(r) := \{\, g \in G \mid \|g\| \leq r \,\}$$
$$G(r-) := \{\, g \in G \mid \|g\| < r \,\}.$$

If $(G, \|\cdot\|)$ *is non-Archimedean, both* $G(r)$ *and* $G(r-)$ *are clopen subgroups of* G*, and* $(G(r), \|\cdot\|)$ *and* $(G(r-), \|\cdot\|)$ *are seminormed groups.*

Definition 2.5. *Let* G *and* H *be seminormed Abelian groups. A group homomorphism* $f \colon G \to H$ *is said to be bounded if* f *satisfies* $\sup_{g \in G(1)} \|f(g)\| < \infty$.

Remark 2.6. *A bounded group homomorphism is continuous.*

The ultrametric has much better properties than Euclidean geometrical spaces in the analysis. For example, the convergence of a sequence is much more simplified.

Lemma 2.7. *For a complete ultrametric space* (X, d)*, a sequence* $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in X^{\mathbb{N}}$ *converges if and only if* $\lim_{n \to \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0$.

Proposition 2.8. *For a complete non-Archimedean normed Abelian group* G*, a sequence* $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in G^{\mathbb{N}}$ *(or a series* $\sum_{n \in N} g_n$*) converges if and only if* $\lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|g_n - g_{n+1}\| = 0$ *(resp.* $\lim_{n \to \infty} \|g_n\| = 0$*).*

Proof. Trivial. □

A seminorm also works for a ring in the way its addition and multiplication are continuous with respect to the induced pseudo-metric topology.

Definition 2.9. *Let* $\mathscr{A}$ *be a ring. A seminorm on* $\mathscr{A}$ *is a seminorm* $\|\cdot\| \colon \mathscr{A} \to [0, \infty)$ *on the underlying additive group of* $\mathscr{A}$ *satisfying the following:*

(iii) $\|1\| \leq 1$*; and*

(iv) $\|ab\| \leq \|a\|\|b\|$ *for any* $a, b \in \mathscr{A}$.

Note that the condition (iii) and (iv) guarantees $\|1\| \in \{0, 1\}$*. A seminorm is said to be power-multiplicative if it satisfies the additional condition*

(iv)' $\|a^n\| = \|a\|^n$ *for any* $a \in \mathscr{A}$ *and* $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$*,*

and is said to be multiplicative if it satisfies the additional condition

(iv)" $\|ab\| = \|a\|\|b\|$ *for any* $a, b \in \mathscr{A}$*,*

which is stronger than the conditions (iv) and (iv)'.

In this paper, we assume that a ring is unital and associative. We do not assume the commutativity or the inequality $1 \neq 0$.

Example 2.10. *For a commutative ring $\mathscr{A}$, there are two canonical seminorms, which are not necessarily distinct. One is the seminorm determined by the additional condition*

(iii)' $\|a\| = 1$ *for any non-nilpotent element* $a \in \mathscr{A}$ *and* $\|a\| = 0$ *for any nilpotent* $a \in \mathscr{A}$,

which is stronger than the condition (iii), and call it the trivial seminorm of $\mathscr{A}$. *The other one is the norm determined by the additional condition*

(iii)" $\|a\| = 1$ *for any non-zero element* $a \in \mathscr{A}$,

which is stronger than the condition (iii), and call it the trivial norm of $\mathscr{A}$. *The condition (i) + (iii)" is equivalent with (i)", and hence the trivial norm of a ring coincides with the trivial norm of an Abelian group. Therefore one did not have to assume the commutativity of* $\mathscr{A}$ *in the definition of the trivial norm.*

The adjective "trivial" is a little ambiguous. In this paper, we only use the term for the triviality of a seminorm or a norm defined above. Instead, we call the trivial ring O the zero ring. The adjectives "zero" and "non-zero" are substituted for the adjectives "trivial" and "non-trivial" in the latter sense.

Remark 2.11. *The trivial seminorm is power-multiplicative. The trivial seminorm is multiplicative if the ring has the unique minimal prime ideal. The trivial norm is power-multiplicative if and only if the ring is semisimple, i.e. the nilradical is the zero ideal, and then it coincides with the trivial seminorm. The trivial norm is multiplicative if and only if the ring is an integral domain or the zero ring. Moreover, a ring has a power-multiplicative norm if and only if it is semisimple, and a ring has a multiplicative norm if and only if it is an integral domain or the zero ring.*

Definition 2.12. *A seminormed ring is data* $(\mathscr{A}, \|\cdot\|)$ *of a ring* $\mathscr{A}$ *with a fixed seminorm* $\|\cdot\| \colon \mathscr{A} \to [0,\infty)$. *The ring* $\mathscr{A}$ *and the seminorm* $\|\cdot\|$ *are called the underlying ring and the seminorm of* $(\mathscr{A}, \|\cdot\|)$. *We usually write* $\mathscr{A}$ *instead of* $(\mathscr{A}, \|\cdot\|)$ *for short. A seminormed ring is said to be a normed ring if its seminorm is a norm. Endow the underlying ring of a normed ring the metric topology given by the norm. A normed ring is said to be complete if its underlying metric space is complete. A seminormed ring is said to be uniform if its seminorm is power-multiplicative. A seminormed ring is said to be a trivial seminormed ring if the underlying ring is commutative and its seminorm is the trivial seminorm of the underlying ring. A normed ring is said to be a trivial normed ring if its norm is the trivial norm of the underlying ring.*

Example 2.13. *The zero ring O has the unique seminorm* $\|\cdot\| \colon O \to [0,\infty)$ *sending* 0 *to* 0. *Then one has* $\|1\| = \|0\| = 0$, *and* $(O, \|\cdot\|)$ *is a trivial normed ring whose norm is multiplicative.*

Moreover, the property $\|1\| \in \{0,1\}$ guarantees that a normed ring satisfies $\|1\| = 1$ if and only if its underlying ring is non-zero.

Remark 2.14. *A trivial normed ring is endowed with the discrete topology, and hence is complete.*

Remark 2.15. *The correspondence from a commutative ring to the associated trivial seminormed ring determines a functor from the category of commutative rings to the category of uniform seminormed commutative rings, which is the left adjoint functor of the forgetful functor.*

Remark 2.16. *The correspondence from a ring to the associated trivial normed ring determines a functor from the category of rings to the category of normed rings, which is the left adjoint functor of the forgetful functor.*

Proposition 2.17. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a complete normed rings. Then one has*

$$1 + \mathscr{A}(1-) \subset \mathscr{A}^{\times}$$

and $\mathscr{A}^{\times} \subset \mathscr{A}$ is open. In addition if $\mathscr{A}$ is non-Archimedean, then the stronger inclusion

$$1 + \mathscr{A}(1-) \subset \mathscr{A}(1)^{\times}$$

holds.

Proof. The first implication is trivial because the convergent radius of the convergent power series $(1 - z)^{-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} z^i \in \mathscr{A}(1)[[z]]$ is $1-$. Take an invertible element $a \in \mathscr{A}^{\times}$. Then for any $b \in \mathscr{A}$ with $|b - a| < \|a^{-1}\|^{-1}$, one has

$$b = a + (b - a) = a(1 + a^{-1}(b - a)) \in \mathscr{A}^{\times}(1 + \mathscr{A}(1-)) = \mathscr{A}^{\times},$$

and hence $\mathscr{A}^{\times} \subset \mathscr{A}$ is open. If $\mathscr{A}$ is non-Archimedean, the ultrametric triangle inequality guarantees $1 + \mathscr{A}(1-) \subset \mathscr{A}(1)$, and it is easy to see that the inverse of an element of $1 + \mathscr{A}(1-)$ is also contained in $1 + \mathscr{A}(1-)$ by the estimation of the norm of the analytic function $(1 - z)^{-1} - 1 \in \mathscr{A}(1)[[z]]$. □

Definition 2.18. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ be seminormed rings. A ring homomorphism $f \colon \mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{B}$ is said to be bounded if f is bounded as a group homomorphism of additive groups.*

Definition 2.19. *Let $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$ be a seminormed ring. A seminormed left $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$-module is data $(M, \|\cdot\|_M)$ of a left $\mathscr{A}$-module with a seminorm $\|\cdot\|_M \colon M \to [0, \infty)$ of the underlying additive group satisfying the following:*

(v) $\|am\|_M \leq |a|_{\mathscr{A}} \|m\|_M$ *for any $a \in \mathscr{A}$ and $m \in M$.*

When $\mathscr{A}$ is commutative, then we say that $(M, \|\cdot\|_M)$ is a seminormed $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$-module for short. In particular $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$ itself is a left $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$-module. Suppose the seminorm $|\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}}$ is multiplicative. A seminormed left $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$-module $(M, \|\cdot\|_M)$ is said to be faithful if it satisfies the additional condition

(v)' $\|am\|_M = |a|_{\mathscr{A}} \|m\|_M$ *for any $a \in \mathscr{A}$ and $m \in M$,*

which is stronger than the condition (v). In particular $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$ itself is a faithful left $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$-module under the assumption of the multiplicativity of the seminorm $|\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}}$.

Definition 2.20. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a seminormed ring, and M and N be seminormed left $\mathscr{A}$-modules. An $\mathscr{A}$-module homomorphism $f\colon M \to N$ is said to be bounded if f is bounded as a group homomorphism of additive groups.*

Definition 2.21. *Let $(\mathscr{A}, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed ring. A subset $S \subset \mathscr{A}$ is said to be bounded if S is a bounded subset of $\mathscr{A}$ as a metric space. An element $a \in \mathscr{A}$ is said to be bounded if the multiplicative subset $\{a^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathscr{A}$ generated by a is bounded. Denote by $\mathscr{A}^\circ \subset \mathscr{A}$ the subset of bounded elements. An element $a \in \mathscr{A}$ is said to be topologically nilpotent if $\lim_{n\to\infty} a^n = 0$, or equivalently $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|a^n\| = 0$. Denote by $\mathscr{A}^{\circ\circ} \subset \mathscr{A}$ the subset of topologically nilpotent elements. If $(\mathscr{A}, \|\cdot\|)$ is commutative and non-Archimedean, $\mathscr{A}^\circ$ is a clopen subring of $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{A}^{\circ\circ}$ is a clopen ideal of $\mathscr{A}^\circ$. $(\mathscr{A}^\circ, \|\cdot\|)$ is a normed commutative ring, and $(\mathscr{A}^{\circ\circ}, \|\cdot\|)$ is a normed $(\mathscr{A}^\circ, \|\cdot\|)$-module.*

Remark 2.22. *Let $(\mathscr{A}, \|\cdot\|)$ be a seminormed ring. Now $\mathscr{A}(1) \subset \mathscr{A}$ is a clopen subring and $\mathscr{A}(r-) \subset \mathscr{A}(1)$ is a clopen two-sided ideal for any $0 < r \leq 1$. If $(\mathscr{A}, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed ring, then one has $\mathscr{A}(1) \subset \mathscr{A}^\circ$ and $\mathscr{A}(1-) \subset \mathscr{A}^{\circ\circ}$. If in addition $(\mathscr{A}, \|\cdot\|)$ is uniform, then $\mathscr{A}(1) = \mathscr{A}^\circ$ and $\mathscr{A}(1-) = \mathscr{A}^{\circ\circ}$.*

Definition 2.23. *Let $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$ be a seminormed ring and suppose the seminorm $|\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}}$ is multiplicative. A seminormed $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$-algebra is data $(\mathscr{B}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathscr{B}})$ of an $\mathscr{A}$-algebra $\mathscr{B}$ with a seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathscr{B}}\colon \mathscr{B} \to [0,\infty)$ of the underlying ring with respect to which $(\mathscr{B}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathscr{B}})$ is a faithful seminormed left $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$-module. In particular $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$ itself is a seminormed $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$-algebra under the assumption of the multiplicativity of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathscr{A}}$. A seminormed $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$-algebra $(\mathscr{B}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{B}})$ is said to be a normed $(\mathscr{A}, |\cdot|_{\mathscr{A}})$-algebra if its underlying seminormed ring is a normed ring.*

In this paper, we assume that an $\mathscr{A}$-algebra $\mathscr{B}$ contains $\mathscr{A}$ in the centre, i.e. $ab = ba$ for any $a \in \mathscr{A}$ and $b \in \mathscr{B}$, when and only when $\mathscr{A}$ is commutative.

Remark 2.24. *If $\mathscr{B}$ is a non-zero normed $\mathscr{A}$-algebra, The condition (v)' implies $|a|_{\mathscr{A}} = |a|_{\mathscr{A}}\|1\|_{\mathscr{B}} = \|a\|_{\mathscr{B}}$.*

Definition 2.25. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a seminormed ring and suppose its seminorm is multiplicative. Let $\mathscr{B}$ and $\mathscr{B}'$ be seminormed $\mathscr{A}$-algebras. An $\mathscr{A}$-algebra homomorphism $f\colon \mathscr{B} \to \mathscr{B}'$ is said to be bounded if f is bounded as a group homomorphism of additive groups.*

Definition 2.26. *A non-Archimedean field is a seminormed ring whose underlying ring is a field and whose seminorm is a multiplicative norm. A non-Archimedean field is said to be a complete valuation field if it is a complete non-Archimedean field. A non-Archimedean field $(k, |\cdot|)$ is said to be a discrete valuation field (or one says the valuation of k is discrete) if the image $|k^\times| \subset (0,\infty)$ is a multiplicative subgroup isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$. A non-Archimedean field $(k, |\cdot|)$ is said to be trivial or one says the valuation of k is trivial if the image $|k^\times| \subset (0,\infty)$ is the trivial group $\{1\}$. The valuation of k is trivial if and only if $(k, |\cdot|)$ is a trivial normed ring.*

Example 2.27. *The associated trivial seminormed ring of a field is a trivial complete valuation field. The correspondence from a field to the associated trivial valuation field determines a functor from the category of fields to the category of non-Archimedean fields, which is the left adjoint functor of the forgetful functor.*

In this paper, we assume that a field is commutative and that the additive unit and the multiplicative unit are distinct. In particular, the zero ring O is excluded from the definition of a field, and hence one has $|k^{\times}| \neq \{0\}$. Henceforth, let k be a non-Archimedean field. We mainly deal with the case k is complete and we will assume it from §4.

Remark 2.28. *The valuation of k is discrete or trivial unless the image $|k^{\times}| \subset (0, \infty)$ is a dense subgroup.*

Definition 2.29. *One has $k(1) = k^{\circ}$ and $k(1-) = k^{\circ\circ}$ because its norm is multiplicative. The clopen subalgebra $k^{\circ} \subset k$ is a clopen integrally closed regular local ring, and $k^{\circ\circ} \subset k^{\circ}$ is the unique maximal ideal. Call k° the ring of integers or the valuation ring of k, and $k^{\circ\circ}$ the maximal ideal of k. Set $\widetilde{k} := k^{\circ}/k^{\circ\circ} = k(1)/k(1-)$. The ring $\widetilde{k}$ is a field.*

Definition 2.30. *Call the field $\widetilde{k}$ the residue field of k.*

Definition 2.31. *A non-Archimedean field k is said to be a local field if k is a complete valuation field with a finite residue field $\widetilde{k}$.*

Throughout this paper, denote by $p \in \mathbb{N}$ the characteristic of the residue field $\widetilde{k}$ of the fixed base field k. We mainly consider the case $p > 0$, and hence we will assume $p > 0$ only when we refer to the residual characteristic p. Otherwise we will assume nothing about the residual characteristic.

Definition 2.32. *A seminormed k-module is said to be a seminormed k-vector space if it is non-Archimedean and faithful. A seminormed k-vector space is said to be a k-Banach space (or simply a Banach space) if it is a complete normed k-module.*

Example 2.33. *For an index set I, consider the k-vector subspace $k^{\oplus I} \subset Map(I, k)$ freely generated by I identified with the subset of the characteristic function of each element of I. The map $\| \cdot \| \colon k^{\oplus I} \to [0, \infty) \colon f \mapsto \|f\| := \max_{i \in I} |f(i)|$ is a norm of the additive group $k^{\oplus I}$, and the normed group $(k^{\oplus I}, \| \cdot \|)$ is a normed k-vector space.*

In the Archimedean case, separable Banach spaces are important for analysis. However in the non-Archimedean case, for a fixed non-Archimedean field there might be no separable Banach space. The base field itself might be inseparable. Now here is the alternative notion of separability, which is equivalent with separability when the base field is separable.

Definition 2.34. *A k-Banach space is said to be of countable type if it contains dense k-vector subspace of countable dimension.*

Definition 2.35. *A normed k-algebra is said to be a Banach k-algebra if it is a complete non-Archimedean normed k-algebra.*

Example 2.36. *For a complete valuation field k and a topological space X, consider the k-subalgebra $C_{bd}(X, k) \subset Map(X, k)$ of continuous functions $f \colon X \to k$ which is bounded in the sense that $\sup_{x \in X} |f(x)| < \infty$. The map $\| \cdot \| \colon C_{bd}(X, k) \to [0, \infty) \colon f \mapsto \|f\| := \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)|$, which is called the supremum norm, is a norm of the ring $C_{bd}(X, k)$, and the normed ring $(C_{bd}(X, k), \| \cdot \|)$ is a commutative uniform k-Banach algebra. One usually consider the case X is a totally disconnected compact Hausdorff topological space because then $C_{bd}(X, k)$ coincides with the k-vector subspace $C(X, k) \subset Map(X, k)$ of continuous functions and there is the non-Archimedean analogue of Gel'fand-Naimark theorem, [Dou], 4.29. Namely, the non-Archimedean Gel'fand transform induces the equivalence between the category of totally disconnected compact Hausdorff topological space to a certain full subcategory of commutative uniform Banach k-algebras. See* [*Ber*]*, 9.2.7.*

Example 2.37. *A closed k-subalgebra $\mathscr{B}$ of a Banach k-algebra $\mathscr{A}$ is again a Banach k-algebra with respect to the restriction of the norm. If $\mathscr{A}$ is commutative (or uniform), then so is $\mathscr{B}$.*

Example 2.38. *For a complete valuation field k and a topological space X, consider the k-vector subspace (possibly non-unital commutative k-subalgebra) $C_0(X, k) \subset C_{bd}(X, k)$ of continuous functions $f \colon X \to k$ which satisfies that the subset $\{x \in X \mid |f(x)| \geq \epsilon\}$ is compact for any $\epsilon > 0$. It is a closed subspace of $C_{bd}(X, k)$. The restriction $\| \cdot \| \colon C_0(X, k) \to [0, \infty)$ of the supremum norm is a norm of the additive group $C_0(X, k)$, and the normed group $(C_0(X, k), \| \cdot \|)$ is a k-Banach space. One usually consider the case X is a totally disconnected locally compact Hausdorff topological space. In particular, a discrete countable topological space is important because it appears as an index set I. We always endow an index set with the discrete topology.*

Recall that Gel'fand-Naimark theorem guarantees that an Archimedean commutative C^*-algebra is canonically isometrically isomorphic to the ring of continuous functions on a compact Hausdorff space. In the non-Archimedean case, the C^*-condition $\|f^* f\| = \|f\|^2$ is nonsense because of the absence of a canonical involution, and one of the direct analogues of C^*-algebras is non-Archimedean commutative uniform Banach algebras. However, there are various classes of commutative uniform Banach algebras other than the class of commutative uniform Banach algebras isometrically isomorphic to the ring of certain functions on a topological space are known. We listed the most significant examples below in this section.

Example 2.39. *For a complete valuation field k, each algebraic extension K of the underlying field k admits the unique canonical functorial extension of the multiplicative norm of k, and K is a commutative uniform normed k-algebra. We always endow K with the norm. If K/k is a finite extension, then K is complete with respect to the norm. The completion C of an algebraic closure $\overline{k}$ of k as a metric space has the natural structure of a Banach k-algebra, and is an algebraically closed field.*

Remark 2.40. *The residue field $\widetilde{C}$ of C is an algebraic closure of the residue field $\widetilde{k}$ of k.*

Example 2.41. *The general Tate algebra*

$$k\{r^{-1}T\} := \left\{ F = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} F_n T^n \in k[[T]] \;\middle|\; \lim_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |F_n| r^n = 0 \right\}$$

associated to the closed disc of radius $r > 0$ *endowed with Gauss norm* $\|F\| := \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |F_n| r^n < \infty$ *is a commutative uniform Banach* k*-algebra with a multiplicative norm. The* k*-affinoid algebra*

$$k\{r^{-1}T, sT^{-1}\} := \left\{ F = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} F_n T^n \in k[[T, T^{-1}]] \;\middle|\; \lim_{n\to\infty} \max\{|F_n| r^n, |F_{-n}| s^{-n}\} = 0 \right\}$$

associated to the closed annulus of radius (s, r) *with* $r > s > 0$ *with Gauss norm* $\|F\| = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \max\{|F_n| r^n, |F_{-n}| s^{-n}\} < \infty$ *is a commutative uniform Banach* k*-algebra.*

Example 2.42. *The* k*-subalgebra*

$$k\{(r-)^{-1}T\} := \left\{ F = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} F_n T^n \in k[[T]] \;\middle|\; \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |F_n| r^n < \infty \right\}$$

of $k[[T]]$ *associated to the open disc of radius* $r > 0$ *endowed with Gauss norm* $\|F\| := \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} |F_n| r^n < \infty$ *is a commutative uniform Banach* k*-algebra with a multiplicative norm.*

Remark 2.43. *The underlying rings of the commutative uniform Banach* k*-algebras* $k\{r^{-1}T\}$*,* $k\{r^{-1}T, sT^{-1}\}$*, and* $k\{(r-)^{-1}\}$ *are integral domains. On the other hand, the ring* $C_{bd}(X, k)$ *of bounded continuous functions on a topological space has enough projections, and is an integral domain if and only if it is isomorphic to* O *or* k*. Therefore the commutative uniform Banach algebras* $k\{r^{-1}T\}$*,* $k\{r^{-1}T, sT^{-1}\}$*, and* $k\{(r-)^{-1}\}$ *are not isomorphic to such a commutative ring. See Proposition 2.46 and its corollary.*

Definition 2.44. *Let* $\mathscr{A}$ *be a Banach* k*-algebra. For an element* $A \in \mathscr{A}$*, denote by* $\mathscr{L}_A \subset \mathscr{A}$ *the closed* k*-subalgebra generated by* A*, i.e. the closure of the image of the* k*-algebra homomorphism* $k[T] \to \mathscr{A} : T \mapsto A$*.*

Remark 2.45. *The* k*-subalgebra* $\mathscr{L}_A \subset \mathscr{A}$ *is a commutative Banach* k*-algebra. Moreover, the commutative Banach* k*-algebra* $\mathscr{L}_A$ *is independent of the choice of* $\mathscr{A}$*. Namely, even if one replaces* $\mathscr{A}$ *by a closed* k*-subalgebra* $\mathscr{B} \subset \mathscr{A}$ *containing* A*, the Banach* k*-algebra* $\mathscr{L}_A \subset \mathscr{B}$ *is stable as a* k*-subalgebra of* $\mathscr{A}$*.*

Proposition 2.46. *Let* X *be a topological space, and suppose that* k *is locally compact. Then the Stone-Čech compactification of* X *with respect to* k *exists, i.e. there is a functor* SC_k *from the category of topological spaces to the category of compact Hausdorff topological space and a natural transform ev from the identity functor to the composition* *of SC_k the forgetful functor such that for each topological space X, the pull-back by the continuous map $ev(X)\colon X \to SC_k(X)$ gives the functorial isometric isomorphism*

$$C(SC_k(X), k) = C_{bd}(SC_k(X), k) \to C_{bd}(X, k)$$

of Banach k-algebras. In other word, any bounded continuous function $f\colon X \to k$ is uniquely extended to a bounded continuous function $SC_k(f)\colon SC_k(X) \to k$.

Proof. Denote by $\mathrm{SC}_k(X)$ the closure of the image of the continuous map

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{ev}(X)\colon X & \to & (k^\circ)^{\mathrm{C_{bd}}(X,k)(1)} \\ x & \mapsto & (f(x))_{f \in \mathrm{C_{bd}}(X,k)(1)}. \end{array}$$

Since k is locally compact, the subset $k^\circ \subset k$ is a compact Hausdorff topological space and hence the codomain of $\mathrm{ev}(X)$ is also a compact Hausdorff topological space. Therefore the closed subset $\mathrm{SC}_k(X)$ is a compact Hausdorff topological space, and the image of X is dense in $\mathrm{SC}_k(X)$ by definition. The universal property is obvious. □

Be careful about the fact that we did not assumed that X is a totally disconnected compact Hausdorff space, and hence bounded continuous functions do not necessarily separate the points of X. The same is true for $\mathrm{SC}_k(X)$. The quotient of $\mathrm{SC}_k(X)$ by the equivalence relation given by the separability by continuous functions is a totally disconnected compact Hausdorff space with the same universal property. Note that the codomain of the corresponding functor is the category of totally disconnected compact Hausdorff topological spaces, the restriction of the functor $\mathrm{C_{bd}}(\cdot, k) = \mathrm{C}(\cdot, k)$ is equivalence to a certain full subcategory of uniform commutative Banach k-algebras. On the other hand, the functor $\mathrm{C_{bd}}(\cdot, k)$ from the category of compact Hausdorff topological spaces itself is not a full functor.

Corollary 2.47. *In the situation of Proposition 2.46, there are a canonical totally disconnected compact Hausdorff topological space Y whose cardinality is at most* $\max\{\#2^{2^X}, \#2^{2^k}\}$ *and a canonical continuous map $\iota\colon X \to Y$ such that the pull-back by ι gives the isometric isomorphism*

$$C(Y, k) \to C_{bd}(X, k)$$

of commutative uniform Banach k-algebras.

The similar property holds for the Alexandroff extension of a topological space. The Alexandroff extension is one of compactifications of a topological space, and coincides with what is called the one-point compactification when the topological space is locally compact and Hausdorff.

Proposition 2.48. *Let X be a topological space, and denote by $AE(X)$ the Alexandroff extension of X. Then the pull-back by the canonical open embedding $\iota\colon X \hookrightarrow AE(X)$ gives the isometric isomorphism*

$$C(AE(X), k) = C_0(AE(X), k) \quad \to \quad C_0(X, k) \oplus k$$

$$f \quad \mapsto \quad ((f - f(\infty))|_X, f(\infty))$$

of commutative uniform k-Banach spaces, where $\infty \in AE(X)$ is the infinitesimal point, i.e. $AE(X) = \iota(X) \cup \{\infty\}$. The k-algebra structure of the left hand side is compatible with that of the right hand side as the unitisation of a non-unital commutative k-algebra.

Proof. For a continuous function $f \colon \mathrm{AE}(X) \to k$, the restriction $(f - f(\infty))|_X \in \mathrm{C}(\mathrm{AE}(X), k)$ satisfies $|\cdot| \circ (f - f(\infty))|_X \in \mathrm{C}_0(\mathrm{AE}(X), \mathbb{R})$ by the definition of the Alexandroff extension. It follows $(f - f(\infty))|_X \in \mathrm{C}_0(\mathrm{AE}(X), k)$.

Now take a compact-supported continuous function $f \in \mathrm{C}_0(X, k)$. Denote by $\tilde{f} \colon \mathrm{AE}(X) \to k$ the map given by setting $\tilde{f}(\iota(x)) := f(x)$ for each $x \in X$ and $\tilde{f}(\infty) := 0$. Then $\tilde{f}$ is continuous by the definition of the Alexandroff extension. The map $(f, a) \mapsto \tilde{f} + a$ is the inverse map of the given k-algebra homomorphism. The isometry is obvious because the supremum norm is compatible with the separation of the underlying topological space. □

Similar with the Stone-Čech compactification, the Alexandroff extension of a topological space is not necessarily a totally disconnected compact Hausdorff topological space, but such a good topological space can be constructed in the same way with the quotient technique. Note that the Alexandroff extension of a totally disconnected locally compact Hausdorff topological space is, being the one-point compactification, a totally disconnected compact Hausdorff topological space.

Corollary 2.49. *In the situation of Proposition 2.48, there are a canonical totally disconnected compact Hausdorff topological space Y whose cardinality is at most $\#X + 1$ and a canonical continuous map $\iota \colon X \to Y$ such that the pull-back by ι gives the isometric isomorphism*

$$C(Y, k) \to C_0(X, k) \oplus k$$

of commutative uniform Banach k-algebras, where the right hand side is endowed with the Banach k-algebra structure as the unitisation of a non-unital commutative uniform Banach k-algebra.

Definition 2.50. *Let V be a seminormed k-vector spaces. An operator on V is a k-linear homomorphism $f \colon W \to V$, where W is a k-vector subspace of V. An operator is said to be bounded if it is a bounded endomorphism. Denote by $\mathscr{B}_k(V) \subset End_k(V)$ the subset of bounded operators.*

Remark 2.51. *Suppose k is non-trivial. An everywhere-defined operator $f \colon V \to V$ is bounded if and only if f is continuous. Significant bounded operators, such derivations and unbounded physical quantities, are basically defined on a proper subspace, and one often means "everywhere-defined" by "bounded".*

Proposition 2.52. *The subset $\mathscr{B}_k(V) \subset End_k(V)$ is a k-subalgebra, and $(\mathscr{B}_k(V), \|\cdot\|)$ is a seminormed k-algebra, where $\|\cdot\| \colon \mathscr{B}_k(V) \to [0, \infty)$ is a map given by setting $\|f\| := \sup_{v \in V(1)} \|f(v)\|$ for each $f \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$. Call $(\mathscr{B}_k(V), \|\cdot\|)$ the bounded operator algebra on V. If V is a normed k-vector space, then $(\mathscr{B}_k(V), \|\cdot\|)$ is a normed k-algebra, and call $\|\cdot\|$ the operator norm. If V is a k-Banach space, then $(\mathscr{B}_k(V), \|\cdot\|)$ is a Banach k-algebra.*

Proof. This can be verified in the totally same way as the corresponding fact in the Archimedean case. ◻

Definition 2.53. *A k-Banach representation is a Banach k-algebra $\mathscr{A}$ endowed with a bounded k-algebra homomorphism $\mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ to the bounded operator algebra on a k-Banach space V.*

Definition 2.54. *A k-Banach representation $\mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ is said to be of countable type if V is of countable type.*

Definition 2.55. *A subset $I \subset V$ of a k-Banach space V is said to be an orthonormal Schauder basis of V if the canonical k-linear homomorphism $k^{\oplus I} \to V$ given by the inclusion $I \hookrightarrow V$ is uniquely extended to the isometric isomorphism*

$$C_0(I,k) \to V.$$

If V is finite-dimensional, then simply call I an orthonormal basis.

Do not confuse $\mathrm{C}_0(I,k)$ with $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(I,k)$. The subset $I \subset \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(I,k)$, identified with the characteristic functions of singletons in I, is not an orthonormal Schauder basis when I is an infinite set. Note that an orthonormal basis of a finite-dimensional k-Banach space is a basis of the underlying k-vector space but the converse does not hold in general. There is a criterion for an orthonormal basis in [BGR], 2.5.1/3 and [BGR], 2.5.2/2, and we refer to it in Lemma 3.11.

Definition 2.56. *A k-Banach space is said to be strictly Cartesian if it admits an orthonormal Schauder basis. In other words, a k-Banach space is strictly Cartesian if and only if it is isometrically isomorphic to the k-Banach space $C_0(I,k)$ for some countable discrete topological space I.*

Be careful that the definition of a strictly Cartesian Banach space above is not compatible with the definition of a strictly Cartesian normed vector space in [BGR], 2.5.2/1 when a Banach space is infinite dimensional.

Example 2.57. *Any k-vector subspace of the n-dimensional k-Banach space k^n is strictly Cartesian with respect to the restriction of the norm of k^n given by its canonical basis for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

In general, any subspace of a finite-dimensional strictly Cartesian Banach space is again strictly Cartesian by [BGR], 2.5.1/4. Be careful that the notion of being strictly Cartesian depends on the choice of the norm. If one equips k^n with another non-canonical norm, then k^n might be not strictly Cartesian. Thus the equivalence of norms does not preserve the property of being strict Cartesian, and conversely a Banach space of countable type always admits an equivalent norm with respect to which it admits an orthonormal Schauder basis by [BGR], 2.7.2/8.

Example 2.58. *The $\mathbb{Q}_p$-Banach spaces $C(\mathbb{Z}_p,\mathbb{Q}_p)$, $C_0(\mathbb{Q}_p,\mathbb{Q}_p)$, and $\mathbb{C}_p$ are strictly Cartesian $\mathbb{Q}_p$-Banach spaces of infinite dimension.*

Definition 2.59. *A k-Banach representation $\mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ is said to be normalisable if V is strictly Cartesian. In particular a normalisable k-Banach representation is of countable type.*

3 Three Reductions

There are three basic ways of reduction, and one of the main theme of this paper is the use of the reduction for the functional calculus of an operator. We always endow spaces obtained by reductions with the discrete topology. For example, the reductions of a Banach k-algebra is a Banach $\widetilde{k}$-algebra with respect to the trivial norm.

Definition 3.1. *Let G be a non-Archimedean seminormed group. For a real number $0 < r \leq 1$, set $\widetilde{G_r} = G_r^{\sim} := G(1)/G(r-)$, and call it the normal reduction of G at radius r. If $r = 1$, write $\widetilde{G} = \widetilde{G_r}$ and simply call it the normal reduction of G. In particular, the notation $\widetilde{k}$ is compatible with the residue field of k. For an element $g \in G(1)$, call its image in $\widetilde{G_r}$ the normal reduction of g at radius r.*

Definition 3.2. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a non-Archimedean seminormed k-algebra. For a positive number $0 < r \leq 1$, the $k(1)$-algebra structure of $\mathscr{A}(1)$ induces the $\widetilde{k_r}$-algebra structure of $\widetilde{\mathscr{A}_r}$. In particular endow $\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}$ with the canonical $\widetilde{k}$-algebra structure.*

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ be non-Archimedean seminormed rings. A ring homomorphism $f \colon \mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{B}$ which is a contraction induces a bounded ring homomorphism $\mathscr{A}(1) \to \mathscr{B}(1)$ and a ring homomorphism $\widetilde{\mathscr{A}_r} \to \widetilde{\mathscr{B}_r}$ for any $r \in (0,1]$.*

In other words, the correspondences $\mathscr{A} \rightsquigarrow \mathscr{A}(1)$ and $\mathscr{A} \rightsquigarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{A}_r}$ are functorial with respect to ring homomorphisms which are contractions. A bounded homomorphism which is not a contraction does not work here.

Proof. Trivial by definition. □

Proposition 3.4. *If $\mathscr{A}$ is a complete non-Archimedean normed ring, then for a positive number $0 < r \leq 1$, the surjective ring homomorphism $\Pi \colon \mathscr{A}(1) \twoheadrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{A}_r}$ induces the surjective group homomorphism $\Pi \colon \mathscr{A}(1)^\times \twoheadrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{A}_r}^\times$. Moreover one has $\Pi^{-1}(\widetilde{\mathscr{A}_r}^\times) = \mathscr{A}(1)^\times$.*

Proof. For an element $a \in \mathscr{A}(1)$, suppose $\overline{a} \in \widetilde{A}_r^\times$. Take a lift $b \in \mathscr{A}(1)$ of the inverse $\overline{a}^{-1} \in \widetilde{A}_r$. Since $\overline{ab - 1} = \overline{a}\overline{a}^{-1} - 1 = 0 \in \widetilde{A}_r$, one has $\|ab - 1\| < r \leq 1$, and hence $ab \in 1 + \mathscr{A}(1-) \subset \mathscr{A}(1)^\times$ by Proposition 2.17. Thus $a \in \mathscr{A}(1)^\times$. □

Definition 3.5. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a commutative non-Archimedean normed ring. Set $\mathscr{A}^{red} := \mathscr{A}^\circ / \mathscr{A}^{\circ\circ}$, and call it the spectral reduction of $\mathscr{A}$. In particular, one has $k^{red} = \widetilde{k}$. For an element $A \in \mathscr{A}^\circ$, call its image in $\mathscr{A}^{red}$ the spectral reduction of A.*

Be careful about the fact that the spectral reduction works only when the normed ring $\mathscr{A}$ is commutative. However, it is still important also for a non-commutative normed ring such as an operator algebra $\mathscr{B}_k(V)$ on a k-Banach space V, because the Banach k-algebra $\mathscr{L}_A \subset \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ is commutative for an operator $A \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ be non-Archimedean normed rings. A bounded ring homomorphism $f \colon \mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{B}$ sends a bounded element to a bounded element, and a topologically nilpotent element to a topologically nilpotent element. Therefore in particular if $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$ is commutative and non-Archimedean, then f induces a bounded ring homomorphism $\mathscr{A}^\circ \to \mathscr{B}^\circ$ and a ring homomorphism $\mathscr{A}^{red} \to \mathscr{B}^{red}$.*

In other words, the correspondences $\mathscr{A} \rightsquigarrow \mathscr{A}^\circ$ and $\mathscr{A} \rightsquigarrow \mathscr{A}^{\mathrm{red}}$ are functorial with respect to bounded homomorphisms, and therefore they might seem to be easy to handle when we deal with commutative Banach algebras. However, it is hard to calculate $\mathscr{A}^\circ$ and $\mathscr{A}^{\mathrm{red}}$ when $\mathscr{A}$ is not uniform, and hence the spectral reduction is applied mainly to uniform Banach algebras.

Proof. Trivial because a bounded homomorphism is continuous and preserves a bounded subset. □

Definition 3.7. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a commutative non-Archimedean normed k-algebra. Endow $\mathscr{A}^{red}$ with the $\widetilde{k}$-algebra structure induced by the k°-algebra structure of $\mathscr{A}^\circ$.*

Definition 3.8. *Let I be a countable index set. The matrix reduction of the operator algebra $\mathscr{B}_k(C_0(I,k))$ is the $\widetilde{k}$-algebra $\mathrm{End}_{\widetilde{k}}(\widetilde{k}^{\oplus I})$ endowed with the canonical k°-algebra homomorphism $\Pi_I \colon \mathscr{B}_k(C_0(I,k))(1) \to \mathrm{End}_{\widetilde{k}}(\widetilde{k}^{\oplus I})$ sending an operator $A \in \mathscr{B}_k(C_0(I,k))(1)$ to a $\widetilde{k}$-linear endomorphism $\Pi(A) \colon \widetilde{k}^{\oplus I} \to \widetilde{k}^{\oplus I}$ whose matrix representation $\overline{T} \in (\widetilde{k}^{\oplus I})^I \subset \widetilde{k}^{I \times I}$ with respect to the canonical basis $I \subset \widetilde{k}^{\oplus I}$ is given as the matrix whose entries are the reduction of the entries of the matrix representation $M \in C_0(I,k)^I \subset k^{I \times I}$ of A with respect to the canonical orthonormal Schauder basis $I \subset C_0(I,k)$. Note that each column of $\overline{M} \in \widetilde{k}^{I \times I}$ surely belongs to $\widetilde{k}^{\oplus I} \subset \widetilde{k}^I$, i.e. its all but finite entries are 0, because each column of $A \in k^{I \times I}$ belongs to $C_0(I,k)$, i.e. its entries are tending to 0. The $\tilde{k}$-linear map $\Pi(A)$ is called the matrix reduction of A.*

Proposition 3.9. *The identity $\mathscr{B}_k(C_0(I,k)) \to \mathscr{B}_k(C_0(I,k))$ induces the canonical $\widetilde{k}$-algebra epimorphism $\overline{\Pi}_I \colon \mathscr{B}_k(C_0(I,k))^\sim \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{End}_{\widetilde{k}}(\widetilde{k}^{\oplus I})$. When I is a finite set, then $\overline{\Pi}_I$ is an isomorphism. When I is an infinite set, then $\overline{\Pi}_I$ is an isomorphism if and only is the valuation of k is discrete or trivial.*

Proof. Obvious. Note that when I is a finite set, or when the valuation of k is discrete or trivial, then the operator norm of a bounded operator on $\mathrm{C}_0(I,k)$ is archived by the absolute value of an entry of its canonical matrix presentation. Otherwise there is a counter-example. □

By Proposition 3.9, when I is a finite set, or when the valuation of k is discrete or trivial, then we always identify the normal reduction and the matrix reduction on $\mathscr{B}_k(\mathrm{C}_0(I,k))$ without mentioning. The reductions are useful when one examines whether a given system is an orthonormal Schauder basis. The following is [BGR], 2.5.1/3.

Lemma 3.10. *For a finite dimensional strictly Cartesian k-Banach space V, a subset $I \subset V(1)$ is an orthonormal basis of V if and only if its reduction $\overline{I} := \{\overline{f} \in \widetilde{V} \mid f \in I\}$ is a finite-dimensional basis of the $\widetilde{k}$-vector space $\widetilde{V}$.*

An infinite-dimensional generalisation immediately follows from the previous lemma.

Proposition 3.11. *Suppose the valuation of k is discrete. For a k-Banach space V with $\|V\| = |k|$, a subset $I \subset V(1)$ is an orthonormal Schauder basis of V if and only if its reduction $\overline{I} := \{\overline{f} \in \widetilde{V} \mid f \in I\}$ is a basis of the $\widetilde{k}$-vector space $\widetilde{V}$.*

In particular it implies that a Banach space V with $\|V\| = |k|$ over a complete discrete valuation field k is always strictly Cartesian. It is a direct consequence of [BGR], 2.5.3/11 and [BGR], 2.4.4/2.

Proof. Suppose I is an orthonormal Schauder basis of V. Then one has the isometric isomorphism $V \cong_k \mathrm{C}_0(I,k)$, and it induces the $\widetilde{k}$-linear isomorphism $\widetilde{V} \cong_{\widetilde{k}} \mathrm{C}_0(I,k)^{\sim} = \widetilde{k}^{\oplus I}$. Therefore obviously the reduction $\overline{I} \subset \widetilde{V}$ is a basis.

On the other hand, suppose the reduction $\overline{I} \subset \widetilde{V}$ is a basis. In particular $\|i\| = 1$ for any $i \in I$. Take an element $(f_i)_{i \in I} \in k^{\oplus I}$ and set $f := \sum_{i \in I} f_i i \in V$. One has $\|f\| \leq \max_{i \in I} |f_i| \|i\| = \max_{i \in I} |f_i|$. Assume $\|f\| < \max_{i \in I} |f_i|$. Let $j \in I$ be the index such that $|f_j| = \max_{i \in I} |f_i|$. Since $\|f\| < \max_{i \in I} |f_i|$, one has $|f_j| > 0$ and $f_j \in k^{\times}$. Now $\|f_j^{-1} f\| < \max_{i \in I} |f_j^{-1} f_i| = 1$, and hence $\overline{f_j^{-1} f} = 0 \in \widetilde{V}$. However $|f_j^{-1} f_i| \leq 1$ and $(\overline{f_j^{-1} f_i})_{i \in I} \in \widetilde{k}^{\oplus I}$ is a non-zero vector because $\overline{f_j^{-1} f_j} = 1 \neq 0 \in \widetilde{k}$. Therefore the reduction $\overline{f_j f} = \sum_{i \in I} \overline{f_j^{-1} f_i} \overline{i}$ is non-zero in $\widetilde{V}$, and it contradicts the calculation above. It follows $\|f\| = \max_{i \in I} |f_i|$ and I is orthonormal. One has obtained the isometric isomorphism $\phi \colon \mathrm{C}_0(I,k) \hookrightarrow V$ onto the image, and it suffices to show ϕ is surjective. Since ϕ is an isometry from a complete metric space, the image $\phi(\mathrm{C}_0(I,k))$ is also complete and hence is closed. Take an element $f \in V$. Set $f^{(0)} := 0 \in V$. Inductively define the sequence $(f^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \phi(k^{\oplus I})^{\mathbb{N}}$ in the following way: If $f - f^{(n)} = 0$, set $f^{(n+1)} := f^{(n)} \in \phi(k^{\oplus I})$. If $f - f^{(n)} \neq 0$, take an element $a \in k^{\times}$ with $\|f - f^{(n)}\| = |a|$. Then $\|a^{-1}(f - f^{(n)})\| = 1$ and there uniquely exists a non-zero coefficient vector $(\overline{f_i})_{i \in I} \in \widetilde{k}^{\oplus I}$ such that $\sum_{i \in I} \overline{f_i} \overline{i} = \overline{a^{-1}(f - f^{(n)})} \in \widetilde{V}$ because $\overline{I} \subset \widetilde{V}$ is a basis. Take a lift $(f_i)_{i \in I} \in k(1)^{\oplus I}$ of $(\overline{f_i})_{i \in I} \in \widetilde{k}^{\oplus I}$, and then one has $\|a^{-1}(f - f^{(n)}) - \sum_{i \in I} f_i i\| < 1$. Set $f^{(n+1)} := f^{(n)} + \sum_{i \in I} a f_i i \in \phi(k^{\oplus I})$. By the construction of $(f^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, the absolute values $(\|f - f^{(n)}\|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in [0, \infty)^{\mathbb{N}}$ is strictly decreasing or at last stable at 0, and hence converges to 0 by the discreteness of the valuation of k. Therefore the series $(f^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \phi(k^{\oplus I})^{\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $f \in V$. Therefore f is contained in the closure of $\phi(k^{\oplus I})$, namely $\phi(\mathrm{C}_0(I,k)) \subset V$, by the completeness of $\mathrm{C}_0(I,k)$. Therefore ϕ is surjective. ◻

Definition 3.12. *Let V be a k-Banach space admitting an orthonormal Schauder basis. Taking an orthonormal Schauder basis $S \subset V$, one obtains the isometric isomorphism*

$$\iota \colon V \to C_0(S,k)$$

of k-Banach spaces, the isometric isomorphism

$$\mathscr{B}_k(\iota) \colon \mathscr{B}_k(V) \to \mathscr{B}_k(C_0(S,k))$$

of Banach k-algebras, the isomorphism

$$\widetilde{\iota} \colon \widetilde{V} \to \widetilde{k}^{\oplus S}$$

of $\widetilde{k}$-vector spaces, and the isomorphism

$$\mathit{End}_{\widetilde{k}}(\widetilde{\iota}) : \mathit{End}_{\widetilde{k}}\left(\widetilde{V}\right) \to \mathit{End}_{\widetilde{k}}\left(\widetilde{k}^{\oplus S}\right)$$

of $\widetilde{k}$-algebras. The matrix reduction of $\mathscr{B}_k(V)$ with respect is the $\widetilde{k}$-algebra $\mathit{End}_{\widetilde{k}}(\widetilde{V})$ endowed with the canonical k°-algebra homomorphism

$$\Pi_V \colon \mathscr{B}_k(V)(1) \xrightarrow{\mathscr{B}_k(\iota)} \mathscr{B}_k(C_0(S,k))(1) \xrightarrow{\Pi_S} \mathit{End}_{\widetilde{k}}\left(\widetilde{k}^{\oplus S}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathit{End}_{\widetilde{k}}(\widetilde{\iota})^{-1}} \mathit{End}_{\widetilde{k}}\left(\widetilde{V}\right).$$

For an operator $A \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)(1)$, call $\Pi(A) \in \mathit{End}_{\widetilde{k}}(\widetilde{V})$ the matrix reduction of A.

Proposition 3.13. *In the situation above, the homomorphism Π_V is independent of the choice of S.*

Proof. The matrix reduction of the matrix presentation of a change of orthonormal Schauder bases coincides with the matrix presentation of the change of reductive bases. □

Remark 3.14. *In the case $V = C_0(I,k)$, one has $\Pi_V = \Pi_I$ identifying $\widetilde{V} = \widetilde{k}^{\oplus I}$ by the natural isomorphism given by the presentation by the canonical basis $I \subset V$. In this case, we denote simply by $\overline{A}$ the matrix reduction $\Pi_V(A) = \Pi_I(A)$ of an operator A with matrix representation M and by $\overline{M}$ the matrix representation of $\overline{A}$.*

Definition 3.15. *Let V be a k-Banach space admitting an orthonormal Schauder basis. An operator $A \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ is said to be reductively scalar if its matrix reduction $\Pi_V(A) \in \mathit{End}_{\widetilde{k}}(\widetilde{V})$ is scalar, i.e. contained in $\widetilde{k}$.*

Definition 3.16. *Let V be a k-Banach space admitting an orthonormal Schauder basis. An operator $A \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ is said to be reductively transcendental if its matrix reduction $\Pi_V(A) \in \mathit{End}_{\widetilde{k}}(\widetilde{V})$ is not integral over $\widetilde{k}$.*

4 Functional Calculus and Unitary Diagonalisability

Throughout this section and the rest of this paper, we assume that the base field k is a complete non-Archimedean field, V is a k-Banach space, and $\mathscr{A}$ is a Banach k-algebra.

Definition 4.1. *An operator $A \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ is said to be unitary if the endomorphism $A \colon V \to V$ is isometric isomorphism.*

We usually give k^n the canonical basis and the canonical structure of the k-Banach space, and identify the operator algebra $\mathscr{B}_k(k^n)$ with the matrix algebra $\mathrm{M}_n(k)$. Otherwise we declare the basis of k^n.

Proposition 4.2. *For a matrix $U \in M_n(k)$, the following are equivalent:*

(i) U is unitary;

(ii) $\|U\| = 1$ *and* $|\det U| = 1$*;*

(iii) $\|U\| = 1$ *and* $\overline{U} \in GL_n(\widetilde{k})$*;*

(iv) The columns of U *form an orthonormal basis of* k^n*;*

(v) $U \in GL_n(k^\circ)$*;*

(vi) $U \in GL_n(k)$ *and* U^{-1} *is unitary; and*

(vii) ${}^tU$ *is unitary.*

Proof. Suppose (i) holds. Since U is an isometric isomorphism on k^n, one has $\|U\| = \|U^{-1}\| = 1$ by the definition of the operator norm. It follows all eigenvalues of U in an algebraic closure of k have norm no greater than 1, and the same holds for U^{-1}. It follows all eigenvalues of U has norm 1, and it follows $|\det U| = 1$. Therefore (i) implies (ii).

Suppose (ii) holds. Then one has $\det \overline{U} = \overline{\det U} \neq 0$, and it follows $\overline{U} \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\widetilde{k})$. Therefore (ii) implies (iii).

The conditions (iii) and (iv) are equivalent. Indeed for a matrix $U \in \mathrm{M}_n(k)$, the columns of $\overline{U}$ form a basis of $\widetilde{k}^n$ if and only if the columns of U form an orthonormal basis of k^n by [BGR], 2.5.1/4.

Suppose (iii) holds. Then Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 3.9 guarantees that $U \in \mathrm{GL}_n(k^\circ)$. Therefore (iii) implies (v).

Suppose (v) holds. The condition $U \in \mathrm{GL}_n(k^\circ)$ guarantees $U, U^{-1} \in \mathrm{M}_n(k^\circ)$ and hence $0 < \|U\|, \|U^{-1}\| \leq 1$. For a vector $v \in k^n$, one has

$$\|v\| \leq \frac{\|v\|}{\|U\|} \leq \|U^{-1}v\| \leq \|U^{-1}\|\|v\| \leq \|v\|,$$

and hence $\|U^{-1}v\| = \|v\|$. Therefore (v) implies (vi).

The condition (vi) obviously implies (i), and by the equivalence of (i) and (ii), it is easy to see that (i) and (vii) are equivalent. □

Corollary 4.3. *If a matrix* $U \in M_n(k)$ *satisfies* ${}^tUU = U{}^tU \in (k^\circ)^\times$*, then* U *is unitary.*

Proof. The condition (v) is obvious. □

Remark 4.4. *There is a unitary matrix which does not satisfy the condition* ${}^tUU = U{}^tU \in (k^\circ)^\times$*. For example, the matrices*

$$U := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, U^{-1} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

are unitary, but one has

$${}^tUU = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \notin (k^\circ)^\times$$

Note that a real matrix (or a complex matrix) gives a congruence transformation if and only if it is an orthonormal matrix (resp. a unitary matrix in the complex sense). The reason why such an example as above exists is because of the non-Archimedean property of the norm. The upper right entry 1 *does not affect the norm of the image.*

Remark 4.5. *As we mentioned, the notion of the unitarity of a matrix deeply depends on the choice of the structure of a* k*-Banach space on* k^n. *One usually equips it the canonical norm associated with the canonical basis, but the change of the basis yields the change of the norm, which is equivalent to the canonical one. For an invertible matrix* $U \in GL_n(k)$ *whose eigenvalues are contained in* k, *if one endows* k^n *with the norm* $\| \cdot \|_b$ *associated with a basis* $b \subset k^n$ *which gives a Jordan normal form of* U, *then* U *presents a unitary operator on the* k*-Banach space* $(k^n, \| \cdot \|_b)$.

Now we introduce the notion of the spectrum of an element in a Banach algebra. This is the analogue of the classical Archimedean spectrum of a bounded operator on a Banach space, and we will deal with the spectrum of an unbounded operator in §7.

Definition 4.6. *Let* R *be a ring and* S *an* R*-algebra. For an element* $A \in S$, *set* $\sigma_S(A) := \{\lambda \in R \mid A - \lambda \notin S^\times\}$, *and call it the spectrum of* A *in* S. *Also call an element of* $\sigma_S(A)$ *a spectrum of* A *in* S. *Similarly call the complement* $k \backslash \sigma_S(A)$ *the resolvent of* A *in* S *and its element a resolvent of* A *in* S.

In particular, consider the case R is a complete valuation field k and S is a Banach k-algebra $\mathscr{A}$. For an element of $A \in \mathscr{A}$, the spectrum $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset k$ of A in $\mathscr{A}$ is defined as that of A in the underlying algebra of $\mathscr{A}$ which is an algebra of the underlying field of k. If $\mathscr{A}$ is a matrix algebra $\mathrm{M}_n(k)$, a matrix $M \in \mathrm{M}_n(k)$ is integral over k but its characteristic polynomial is not necessarily decomposed in k when k is not algebraically closed. Therefore the spectrum $\sigma_{\mathrm{M}_n(k)}(M)$ might be empty. Of course if k is algebraically closed, the spectrum of a matrix is non-empty. Now how about the spectrum of an operator on the infinite-dimensional Banach space? In the Archimedean case, the spectrum of an element of a Banach $\mathbb{C}$-algebra is non-empty. The non-emptiness is derived from Liouville's theorem for the resolvent function, which is an analytic function on a $\mathbb{C}$-Banach space, and it directly implies Gel'fand-Mazur theorem. On the other hand in the non-Archimedean case, it is well-known that a complete valuation field always has a counter-example for Gel'fand-Mazur theorem. The same proof is no longer valid because the resolvent function is just locally analytic but is not rigid analytic. Liouville's Theorem surely holds for a rigid analytic function, which is easily verified using the Shnirel'man integral, but does not for a general locally analytic function. The main target of our spectral theory is the operator algebra on a strictly Cartesian Banach space, but there is a counter-example even for such a good Banach space.

Example 4.7. *Consider the case* $k = \mathbb{C}_p$, *and denote by* $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ *the residue field* $\overline{\mathbb{C}}_p$, *which is an algebraic closure of* $\mathbb{F}_p$. *Denote by* $[\cdot] \colon \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p \to \mathbb{C}_p$ *the canonical Teichmüller embedding sending a root of unity* $a \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p^\times$ *to the root of unity* $[a] \in \mathbb{C}_p^\times$ *with* $\overline{[a]} = a$. *Set* $I := \mathbb{N} \sqcup (\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p \times \mathbb{N})$, *and then* I *is a countable discrete topological space. For a strictly Cartesian*

$\mathbb{C}_p$-Banach space $C_0(I, \mathbb{C}_p)$, denote by $1_z \in C_0(I, \mathbb{C}_p)$ the image of $z \in I$ by the canonical embedding $I \hookrightarrow C_0(I, \mathbb{C}_p)$. Then the collection I identified with the subset $\{1_z \mid z \in I\} \subset C_0(I, \mathbb{C}_p)$ forms an orthonormal Schauder basis of $C_0(I, \mathbb{C}_p)$. Consider the operator

$$\begin{array}{rcl} A \colon \mathbb{C}_p^{\oplus I} & \to & C_0(I, \mathbb{C}_p) \\ 1_z & \mapsto & \begin{cases} 1_{n+1} & (z = n \in \mathbb{N} \subset I) \\ 1_{(0,n-1)} & (z = (0,n) \in \{0\} \times \mathbb{N}_+ \subset I) \\ 1 + [a]1_{a,0} & (z = (a,0) \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p \times \{0\} \subset I) \\ 1_{(a,n-1)} + [a]1_{(a,n)} & (z = (a,n) \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p^{\times} \times \mathbb{N}_+ \subset I) \end{cases} \end{array}$$

densely defined on $C_0(I, \mathbb{C}_p)$. Since $\|A\| = 1$ by the estimation of the norms of entries of the canonical matrix representation, A is uniquely extended to an everywhere defined bounded operator, and one has $\sigma_{\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(C_0(I,\mathbb{C}_p))}(A) \subset \mathbb{C}_p^{\circ}$.

For an element $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_p^{\circ}$, consider the operator

$$\begin{array}{rcl} B \colon \mathbb{C}_p^{\oplus I} & \to & C_0(I, \mathbb{C}_p) \\ 1_z & \mapsto & \begin{cases} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda^{n-i-1} 1_i + \lambda^n \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (\lambda - [\overline{\lambda}])^i 1_{(\overline{\lambda},i)} & (z = n \in \mathbb{N} \subset I) \\ \sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} (\lambda - [\overline{\lambda}])^{i-n-1} 1_{([\overline{\lambda}],i)} & (z = (\overline{\lambda}, n) \in \{\overline{\lambda}\} \times \mathbb{N} \subset I) \\ ([\overline{\lambda}] - a)^{-n} 1_{([\overline{\lambda}],0)} - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i}^{n-1} \frac{j!([\overline{\lambda}]-a)^{n-j-2}(-a)^{j-i}}{(j-i)!i!} 1_{(a,i)} & (z = (a,n) \in (\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p \backslash \{\overline{\lambda}\}) \times \mathbb{N} \subset I) \end{cases} \end{array}$$

densely defined on $C_0(I, \mathbb{C}_p)$. Since one has $\|B\| = 1$ by the estimation of the norms of entries of the canonical matrix representation, B is uniquely extended to an everywhere defined bounded operator, and it is easy to see that $(A-\lambda)B = B(A-\lambda) = 1 \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(C_0(I, \mathbb{C}_p))$ calculating the images of elements in the canonical basis $I \subset C_0(I, \mathbb{C}_p)$. Therefore $A - \lambda \in \mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(C_0(I, \mathbb{C}_p))^{\times}$. Thus one has $\sigma_{\mathscr{B}_{\mathbb{C}_p}(C_0(I,\mathbb{C}_p))}(A) = \emptyset$.

Since the aim of this paper is to construct a criterion for the normality of an operator, i.e. the admissibility of the continuous functional calculus, an operator with empty spectrum is exceptional. We mainly deal with an operator with spectrum large enough.

Proposition 4.8. *Let R be a ring, and S and T R-algebras. For an R-algebra homomorphism $\phi \colon S \to T$ and an element $A \in S$, one has $\sigma_T(\phi(A)) \subset \sigma_S(A)$.*

Proof. Trivial because $\phi(S^{\times}) \subset T^{\times}$. □

In particular, the inclusion $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{A}(1)}(A)$ for an element $A \in \mathscr{A}(1)$ is important. Here $\mathscr{A}(1)$ is regarded as a k°-algebra. Note that unlike an Archimedean C^*-algebra, the spectrum $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ depends not only on A but also $\mathscr{A}$. It is because the proof of the independence of the choice of $\mathscr{A}$ in the Archimedean case heavily uses the topological property of the real line $\mathbb{R}$ and the complex plain $\mathbb{C}$. See [Dou], 4.28.

Example 4.9.

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \sigma_{k\{T\}}(T) & = & k^{\circ} \\ \sigma_{k\{T,T^{-1}\}} & = & (k^{\circ})^{\times} = k^{\circ} \backslash k^{\circ\circ}. \end{array}$$

Proposition 4.10. *For an element $A \in \mathscr{A}$, its spectrum $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset k$ is a bounded closed subset.*

Proof. For an element $a \in k$ with $|a| > \|A\|$, one has $\|a^{-1}A\| < 1$ and hence

$$A - a = -a(1 - a^{-1}A) \in k^{\times}(1 + \mathscr{A}(1-)) \subset \mathscr{A}^{\times}$$

by Proposition 2.17. Therefore $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ is contained in $\{a \in k \mid |a| \leq \|A\|\}$ and is bounded.

Take a resolvent $a \in k \backslash \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. For an element $b \in k$ with $|b - a| < \|(A - a)^{-1}\|$, one has $\|(b - a)(A - a)^{-1}\| < 1$ and hence

$$A - b = (A - a) - (b - a) = (A - a)(1 - (b - a)(A - a)^{-1}) \in \mathscr{A}^{\times}(1 + \mathscr{A}(1-)) \subset \mathscr{A}^{\times}$$

by Proposition 2.17. Therefore $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset k$ is closed. □

Corollary 4.11. *Suppose k is a local field, Definition 2.31. For an element $A \in \mathscr{A}$, its spectrum $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset k$ is compact.*

Proof. Trivial because k° is compact and any closed disc of radius in $|k^{\times}| \subset (0, \infty)$ is isomorphic to k°. □

Proposition 4.12. *For an element $A \in \mathscr{A}(1)$, one has*

$$\sigma_{\mathscr{A}(1)}(A) = \bigcup_{\overline{\lambda} \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})} \overline{\lambda}.$$

Be careful the an element $\overline{\lambda}$ of the quotient set $\widetilde{\mathscr{A}} = \mathscr{A}(1)/\mathscr{A}(1-)$ is a coset, which is a subset of $\mathscr{A}(1)$, in the sense of the set-theoretical tautology.

Proof. The assertion is the direct implication from Proposition 3.4. □

The spectrum is deeply related with Berkovich's spectrum, [Ber], 1.2. See also [Ber], 7.1.2.

Proposition 4.13. *Suppose $\mathscr{A}$ is commutative. For an element $A \in \mathscr{A}$, denote by $A^{*}(\mathscr{M}(\mathscr{A})(k)) \subset k$ the image of the Berkovich's non-Archimedean Gel'fand transform $A^{*} \colon \mathscr{M}(\mathscr{A})(k) \to k \colon x \mapsto A(x)$ associated to A, where $\mathscr{M}(\mathscr{A})(k)$ is the k-rational locus of Berkovich's spectrum $\mathscr{M}(\mathscr{A})$. Then one has $A^{*}(\mathscr{M}(\mathscr{A})(k)) \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. In addition if $Max(\mathscr{A}) \subset Spec(\mathscr{A})$ is contained in the k-rational locus $Spec(\mathscr{A})(k)$, then the equality $A^{*}(\mathscr{M}(\mathscr{A})(k)) = \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ holds.*

Proof. For a resolvent $\lambda \in k \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$, one has $A - \lambda \in \mathscr{A}$ and hence there is no prime ideal of $\mathscr{A}$ containing $A - \lambda$. On the other hand, the support of a point of $\mathscr{M}(\mathscr{A})$ is a prime ideal, and hence there is no point of $\mathscr{M}(\mathscr{A})$ $A - \lambda$ whose support contains $A - \lambda$. In particular $\lambda \notin A^{*}(\mathscr{M}(\mathscr{A})(k))$. Therefore $A^{*}(\mathscr{M}(\mathscr{A})(k)) \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$.

Moreover if $\mathrm{Max}(\mathscr{A})$ is contained in $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathscr{A})(k)$, then for a spectrum $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$, there is a maximal ideal $m \subset \mathscr{A}$ containing $A - \lambda$ with automatically $\mathscr{A}/m \cong_{k} k$. By the proof of [Ber], 1.2.1, there is a point $x \in \mathscr{M}(\mathscr{A})$ such that its support is m. It follows that $(A - \lambda)(x) = 0$, and hence $\lambda = A(x) \in A^{*}(\mathscr{M}(\mathscr{A})(k))$. □

Definition 4.14. *For an element $A \in \mathscr{A}$, denote by $\mathscr{L}_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset \mathscr{A}$ the closure of the localisation of the k-subalgebra $k[A] \subset \mathscr{A}$ by the elements in $k[A] \cap \mathscr{A}^{\times}$. Unlike $\mathscr{L}_{\mathrm{A}}$, the commutative Banach k-algebra $\mathscr{L}_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ depends on the choice of not only A but also the Banach k-algebra $\mathscr{A}$ containing A.*

Lemma 4.15. *For a non-empty bounded closed subset $\sigma \subset k$, the coordinate function $z \colon \sigma \hookrightarrow k$ is a bounded continuous function.*

Proof. Trivial by the definition of the supremum norm. □

Definition 4.16. *For a non-empty bounded closed subset $\sigma \subset k$, consider the k-subalgebra $k[z] \subset C(\sigma, k)$ generated by z. By Lemma 4.15, $k[z]$ is contained in $C_{bd}(\sigma, k)$. Denote by $C_{rig}(\sigma, k)$ the commutative Banach k-subalgebra $\mathscr{L}_{C_{bd}(\sigma,k)}(z) \subset C_{bd}(\sigma, k)$. Call an element of $C_{rig}(\sigma, k)$ a rigid continuous function on $\sigma \subset k$.*

Remark 4.17. *A function in $C_{rig}(\sigma, k)$ is obviously a Krasner analytic function by definition. On the other hand, a bounded Krasner analytic function is not necessarily an element of $C_{rig}(\sigma, k)$. Functions in $C_{rig}(\sigma, k)$ is more "rigid" than bounded Krasner analytic functions.*

Proposition 4.18. *In the situation in Definition 4.16, one has $C_{rig}(\sigma, k)^{\times} = C_{rig}(\sigma, k) \cap C_{bd}(\sigma, k)^{\times}$.*

Proof. The inclusion $\subset$ is obvious. Take a rigid continuous function $f \colon \sigma \to k$ invertible in $\mathrm{C_{bd}}(\sigma, k)$. By the definition of $\mathrm{C_{rig}}(\sigma, k)$, for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$, there is a continuous function $g \colon \sigma \to k$ contained in the localisation of $k[z] \subset \mathrm{C_{bd}}(\sigma, k)$ such that $\|f - g\| < \epsilon \min\{\|f^{-1}\|^{-1}, |f^{-1}\|^{-2}\}$. For any point $\lambda \in \sigma$, one has $|f(x)| = |f^{-1}(x)|^{-1} \geq \|f^{-1}\|^{-1} > \|f - g\| \geq |f(x) - g(x)|$, and hence $|g(x)| = |f(x)| > 0$. Therefore $|g(x)|^{-1} = |f(x)|^{-1} = |f^{-1}(x)| \leq \|f^{-1}\|$, and it follows that g is invertible in $\mathrm{C_{bd}}(\sigma, k)$. The inverse $g^{-1} \in \mathrm{C_{bd}}(\sigma, k)$ is contained in the localisation of $k[z]$ because the polynomial ring $k[T]$ is a principal ideal domain. Moreover one obtains

$$\|f^{-1} - g^{-1}\| \leq \|f\|\|g\|\|g - f\| = \|f\|^2\|f - g\| < \epsilon,$$

and thus $f \in \mathrm{C_{rig}}(\sigma, k)$. □

Lemma 4.19. *In the situation in Definition 4.16, one has $\sigma_{C_{rig}(\sigma,k)}(z) = \sigma$.*

Proof. The inclusion $\supset$ is trivial because σ coincides with the image of z. The opposite inclusion $\subset$ directly follows by the definition of $\mathrm{C_{rig}}(\sigma, k)$. □

Proposition 4.20. *In the situation in Definition 4.16, denote by $k[T]_{(\sigma)} \subset k(T)$ the localisation of $k[T]$ by polynomials of with no zeros on σ. The canonical surjective k-algebra homomorphism $k[T] \to k[z] \colon T \mapsto z$ is uniquely extended to $k[T]_{(\sigma)} \to C_{rig}(\sigma, k)$.*

Proof. A function $f \in \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma, k)$ is invertible in $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma, k)$ if and only if its absolute value function $|f| \colon \sigma \to [0, \infty)$ has a positive lower bound on σ. Take a polynomial $P \in k[T]$ with no zeros on σ. Take an algebraic closure of k and let C/k be the completion of it with respect to the unique extension of the valuation. Denote by $S \subset C \backslash \sigma$ the finite set of the zeros of P. Since S is compact and σ is closed, the distance d between S and σ is positive definite. Presenting $P = a \prod_{s \in S} (T - s)^{n_s}$ by the coefficient $a \in k^{\times}$ and multiplicities $(n_s)_{s \in S} \in \mathbb{N}_{+}^{S}$, one has $|P(\lambda)| = |a| \prod_{s \in S} |\lambda - s|^{n_s} \geq |a| d^n$ for any $\lambda \in \sigma$, where $n \coloneqq \sum_{s \in S} n_s$. Therefore $\inf_{\lambda \in \sigma} |P(\lambda)| \geq |a| d^n > 0$, and hence $|P(z)| \colon \sigma \to [0, \infty)$ admits a positive lower bound $|a| d^n$. □

Proposition 4.21. *In the situation above, if $\sigma \subset k$ is compact, then $k[z]$ is dense in $C_{rig}(\sigma, k)$ and one has the equalities $C_0(\sigma, k) = \mathscr{L}_z \subset C_{rig}(\sigma, k) = C_{bd}(\sigma, k) = C(\sigma, k)$.*

Remark that if σ is not compact, the inclusion $\mathrm{C}_0(\sigma, k) \subset \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma, k)$ does not hold in general.

Proof. This is the well-known p-adic analogue of Stone-Weierstrass theorem, which is originally verified by Kaplansky in his paper [Kap] as a generalisation of Dieudonné's theorem, [Die]. For other sophisticated proofs, see [Mur1], 1.7 or [Ber], 9.2.6. □

Proposition 4.22. *In the situation in Definition 4.16, suppose σ is compact and $\sigma \neq \{0\}$. The compactness of the non-empty set σ guarantees that there is a point $a \in \sigma$ with $|a| = \sup_{\lambda \in \sigma} |\lambda| > 0$. For an element $a \in k^{\times}$ with $|a| = \sup_{\lambda \in \sigma} |\lambda| > 0$, the canonical homeomorphism $\sigma \to a^{-1}\sigma \subset k^{\circ}$ and the canonical projection $k^{\circ} \twoheadrightarrow \widetilde{k}$ induces a surjective map $\sigma_{C(\sigma,k)}(z) \to \sigma_{C(\sigma,k)^{\sim}}(\overline{a^{-1}z})$.*

Proof. Since $\sigma_{\mathrm{C}(\sigma,k)}(z) = \sigma_{\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma,k)}(z) = \sigma$ and $\sigma_{\mathrm{C}(\sigma,k)}(a^{-1}z) = \sigma_{\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma,k)}(a^{-1}z) = \sigma_{\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(a^{-1}\sigma,k)}(z') = a^{-1}\sigma$ for the coordinate function $z' \colon a^{-1}\sigma \hookrightarrow k$, replacing σ by $a^{-1}\sigma$, we may and do assume $a = 1$. Note that $\mathrm{C}(\sigma, k)(1) = \mathrm{C}(\sigma, k^{\circ})$ and $\mathrm{C}(\sigma, k)^{\sim} = \mathrm{C}(\sigma, \widetilde{k})$. Since $\widetilde{k}$ is discrete, the latter Banach $\widetilde{k}$-algebra is the $\widetilde{k}$-subalgebra of $\widetilde{k}^{\sigma}$ consisting of locally constant functions. The inverse of a locally constant function invertible in $\widetilde{k}^{\sigma}$, which is a function with no zeros, is again locally constant. Since the image of $\overline{z} \colon \sigma \to \widetilde{k}$ is the image $\overline{\sigma} \subset \widetilde{k}$ of σ by the canonical projection $k^{\circ} \to \widetilde{k}$, one has $\sigma_{\mathrm{C}(\sigma,k)^{\sim}}(\overline{z}) = \overline{\sigma}$, which was what we wanted. □

Definition 4.23. *For an element $A \in \mathscr{A}$, a bounded k-algebra homomorphism $\iota_A \colon C_{rig}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \to \mathscr{A}$ sending the coordinate function $z \colon \sigma \hookrightarrow k$ to A is unique because the localisation of $k[z] \subset C_{rig}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)$ is dense. If such a bounded k-algebra homomorphism ι_A exists and is an isometry, call it the continuous functional calculus of A in $\mathscr{A}$.*

If A admits the continuous functional calculus in $\mathscr{A}$, then the spectrum $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset k$ is non-empty because the coordinate function of $\emptyset \subset k$ is 0 but $0 \in \mathscr{A}$ has the non-empty spectrum $\{0\} \subset k$. Remark that the image of the continuous functional calculus, if exists, is a closed k-subalgebra of the commutative Banach k-algebra $\mathscr{L}_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. Moreover if $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ is compact, the continuous functional calculus induces the isometric isomorphism $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \cong_k \mathscr{L}_A$ by Proposition 4.21. First we deal with the continuous functional calculus of a bounded normal operator. The continuous functional calculus of an unbounded normal operator will appear in §7.

Proposition 4.24. *If an element $A \in \mathscr{A}$ admits the continuous functional calculus of A in $\mathscr{A}$, then one has*

$$\|A\| = \sup_{\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)} |\lambda|.$$

Proof. Trivial because the right hand side is the supremum norm of the coordinate function $z \colon \sigma \hookrightarrow k$. ◻

Definition 4.25. *A bounded operator A on a k-Banach space V is said to be a bounded k-valued normal operator if A admits the continuous functional calculus in $\mathscr{B}_k(V)$.*

Definition 4.26. *A matrix $M \in M_n(k)$ is said to be a k-valued normal matrix if M corresponds to a bounded k-valued normal operator on k^n as the matrix representation with respect to the canonical basis.*

Example 4.27. *A matrix $M \in M_n(k)$ is a k-valued normal matrix if and only if M is diagonalisable by a unitary matrix in k.*

Remark 4.28. *Note that we always equip k^n with the canonical norm associated with the canonical basis in this paper. As we sometimes mentioned, the notion of the unitarity of an operator on k^n makes sense only when one fixes the norm of k^n, and if one changes the basis, the normality of an operator differs. It is remarkable that a matrix is diagonalisable in k if and only if it presents a bounded k-valued normal operator on k^n with respect to some norm of k^n.*

Definition 4.29. *A bounded operator A on a k-Banach space V is said to be a bounded normal operator if the image of $A \otimes 1 \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)\hat{\otimes}_k K$ by the bounded K-algebra homomorphism $\mathscr{B}_k(V)\hat{\otimes}_k K \to \mathscr{B}_K(V\hat{\otimes}_k K)$ is a bounded K-valued normal operator for some extension K/k of complete valuation fields.*

Now one has obtained one of formulations of p-adic Quantum theory with bounded p-adic physical quantities. For the unbounded generalisation, see Definition 7.24.

Definition 4.30 (p-adic physical state)**.** *A p-adic state vector over k is a non-zero vector $| \phi \rangle$ in a strictly Cartesian k-Banach space V. When there is no ambiguity of the base field k, just say $| \phi \rangle$ a p-adic vector state in V. A p-adic physical state represented by $| \phi \rangle \in V$ is the lay $[| \phi \rangle]$ in the projective space $\mathbb{P}(V) := (V \backslash \{0\})/k^{\times}$.*

Definition 4.31 (bounded p-adic physical quantity)**.** *A bounded p-adic physical quantity over k is a bounded k-valued normal operator on a strictly Cartesian k-Banach space.*

Definition 4.32. *For a bounded p-adic physical quantity A over k on a strictly Cartesian k-Banach space V, a clopen subset $S \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{B}_k(V)}(A)$ is said to be A-measurable if the characteristic function $1_S : \sigma_{\mathscr{B}_k(V)}(A) \to k$ is contained in $C_{rig}(\sigma_{\mathscr{B}_k(V)}(A), k)$. Denote by $\Omega_A \subset 2^{\sigma_{\mathscr{B}_k(V)}(A)}$ the collection of A-measurable clopen subsets.*

Example 4.33. *In the situation above, if the spectrum* $\sigma_{\mathscr{B}_k(V)}(A)$ *is compact, then all clopen subsets are A-measurable by Proposition 4.21.*

Definition 4.34 (Born rule)**.** *For a bounded p-adic physical quantity A over k on a strictly Cartesian k-Banach space V, define the probability function* $\mathscr{P}_{\cdot}(A \in \cdot)$ *in the following way:*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathscr{P}_{\cdot}(A \in \cdot)\colon \mathbb{P}(V) \times \Omega_A & \to & [0,1] \\ ([\mid \phi \rangle], S) & \mapsto & \mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in S) := \|\iota_A(1_S) \mid \phi \rangle\|, \end{array}$$

where $\mid \phi \rangle \in [\mid \phi \rangle]$ *is a representative with the normalisation condition* $\| \mid \phi \rangle\| = 1$*. The probability function is well-defined. For a p-adic physical state* $[\mid \phi \rangle]$ *and an A-measurable clopen subset* $S \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{B}_k(V)}(A)$*, call* $\mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in S)$ *the probability that the observed value of A in* $[\mid \phi \rangle]$ *is contained in* S*.*

Remark 4.35. *The probability is non-Archimedean, and hence is not additive. For a p-adic physical state* $[\mid \phi \rangle] \in \mathbb{P}(V)$ *and A-measurable clopen subsets* $S, S' \in \Omega_A$*, one has the following properties:*

(i) $\mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in \emptyset) = 0$, $\mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in \sigma_{\mathscr{B}_k(V)}(A)) = 1$*;*

(ii) Even if $\mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in S) = 1$ *and* $S \cap S' = \emptyset$*, one does not have* $\mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in S') = 0$*;*

(iii) The non-Archimedean property

$$\mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in S \cup S') \leq \max\left\{\mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in S), \mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in S')\right\}$$

holds;

(iv) If $S \subset S'$*, the monotonousness*

$$\mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in S) \leq \mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in S')$$

holds; and

(v) If $S \cap S' = \emptyset$*, the non-Archimedean orthogonality*

$$\mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in S \sqcup S') = \max\left\{\mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in S), \mathscr{P}_{[\mid \phi \rangle]}(A \in S')\right\}$$

holds.

For the proofs of the properties (iii)-(v), see Proposition 6.11 and Proposition 6.12.

One of the main aims of this paper is to establish an algorithm for the criterion of the unitarity of an operator by the use of the information of the reduction. There are two cases concerning the reduction. The one is the case that the reduction has the finite spectrum, and the other one is the case that the reduction has the infinite spectrum. We will deal with the infinite reductive spectrum case in §5 and with the finite reductive spectrum case in §6. Note that an operator with infinite reductive spectrum has ample information in its reduction, while that with finite reductive spectrum does not. In particular, an operator with compact spectrum is usually reductively finite, and hence the reduction once works little. The repetition of the reductions are valid there.

Definition 4.36. *An element* $A \in \mathscr{A}$ *is said to admit the reductive continuous functional calculus if* $\|A\| \in |k^\times|$ *and if for an element* $a \in k^\times$ *with* $\|A\| = |a|$ *the normal reduction* $\overline{a^{-1}A} \in \widetilde{A}$ *of* $a^{-1}A \in \mathscr{A}(1)$ *admits the continuous functional calculus* $i_{\overline{a^{-1}A}} \colon C(\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{a^{-1}A}), \widetilde{k}) \to \widetilde{A}$.

Example 4.37. *A matrix* $M \in M_n(k)$ *admits the reductive continuous functional calculus if and only if* $M \neq 0$ *and for an element* $a \in k^\times$ *with* $\|M\| = |a|$ *the matrix reduction* $\overline{a^{-1}M} \in M_n(k)^\sim = M_n(\widetilde{k})$ *is diagonalisable in* $\widetilde{k}$.

It is easy to see that the normality implies the reductive normality. Note that one of the main theme of this paper is when the reductive normality implies the normality. See Theorem 5.2, Theorem 6.7, and Theorem 6.22.

Proposition 4.38. *If a non-zero element* $A \in \mathscr{A} \backslash \{0\}$ *has the compact spectrum and admits the continuous functional calculus, then* A *admits the reductive continuous functional calculus.*

Proof. Since $A \neq \{0\}$ admits the continuous functional calculus, one has $\|A\| = |k^\times|$ by Proposition 4.24 and by the compactness of $\sigma := \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. Replacing A by $a^{-1}A$ for an element $a \in k^\times$ with $\|A\| = |a|$, we may and do assume $\|A\| = 1$. We follow the conventions in the proof of Proposition 4.22. To begin with, we verify $\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) = \overline{\sigma}$. Since $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{A}(1)}(A)$ by definition, the canonical projection $k^\circ \to \widetilde{k}$ induces the reduction map $\sigma \to \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$ by Proposition 3.4, and hence one has $\overline{\sigma} \subset \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$. Assume the reduction map $\sigma \to \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$ is not surjective, and take a reductive spectrum $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$ which is not contained in the image $\overline{\sigma}$. Take a representative $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Due to the choice of Λ, one has $|\lambda' - \lambda| = 1$ for any $\lambda' \in \sigma$, and hence $(z - \lambda)^{-1} \in \mathrm{C}(\sigma, k)(1)^\times$. It follows $\overline{z} - \Lambda = \overline{z - \lambda} \in (\mathrm{C}(\sigma, k)^\sim)^\times$ by Proposition 3.4, and it contradicts the condition $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$. Thus one has $\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) = \overline{\sigma}$.

Since the continuous functional calculus $\iota_A \colon \mathrm{C}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \to \mathscr{A}$ is an isometry, it induces the injective ring homomorphism $\widetilde{\iota}_A \colon \mathrm{C}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)^\sim \to \widetilde{\mathscr{A}}$. For an element $f = (f_\Lambda)_{\Lambda \in \overline{\sigma}} \in \widetilde{k}^{\overline{\sigma}}$, the composition

$$c(f) \colon \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) = \sigma \twoheadrightarrow \overline{\sigma} \xrightarrow{f} \widetilde{k}$$

sending $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ to $f_{\overline{\lambda}}$ is locally constant, and hence one obtains a $\widetilde{k}$-algebra homomorphism

$$\iota_{\overline{A}} \colon \mathrm{C}\left(\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}), \widetilde{k}\right) = \widetilde{k}^{\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})} = \widetilde{k}^{\overline{\sigma}} \xrightarrow{c} \mathrm{C}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)^\sim \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\iota}_A} \widetilde{\mathscr{A}},$$

which is obviously injective and sends the coordinate function $\overline{z} \colon \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) \hookrightarrow \widetilde{k}$ to $\overline{\iota_A(z)} = \overline{A} \in \widetilde{\mathscr{A}}$. This is the reductive continuous functional calculus of $\overline{A}$. ◻

We define a holomorphic functional calculus of an operator. In the Archimedean case, the regularity "holomorphic" of a complex function means that the function admits the Taylor development at each point in the domain, but such a regularity is very weak in the non-Archimedean case because a non-Archimedean field k is totally disconnected. Therefore we use here a stronger regularity: "rigid analytic". Denote by $\mathbb{A}_k^1$ Berkovich's analytic space called an affine line over k, which is the analytification of the scheme-theoretic affine line $\mathrm{Spec}(k[T])$, and we use a rational domain of $\mathbb{A}_k^1$ containing the spectrum of an operator as the domain of a holomorphic functional calculus. The rationality is essential for the uniqueness of the holomorphic functional calculus because an affinoid domain is rational if and only if the image of the suitable localisation of the global section is dense in the corresponding affinoid algebra. For convensions here, see [Ber].

Definition 4.39. *For an element $A \in \mathscr{A}$, a bounded k-algebra homomorphism $\iota_A \colon H^0(V, O_{\mathbb{A}_k^1}) \to \mathscr{A}$ sending the coordinate function $z \colon V \hookrightarrow k$ to A is unique for a rational neighbourhood $V \subset \mathbb{A}_k^1$ of $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$, namely, a closed subset $V \subset \mathbb{A}_k^1$ which is contained in a sufficiently large closed disc of $\mathbb{A}_k^1$ as a rational domain and which contains the spectrum $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset k$ identifying the k-rational locus $k \cong \mathbb{A}_k^1(k)$ as a subspace of the affine line $\mathbb{A}_k^1$. If such a bounded k-algebra homomorphism ι_A exists and is an isometry, call it a holomorphic functional calculus of A in $\mathscr{A}$.*

The definition of a holomorphic functional calculus depends on the choice of a rational neighbourhood $V \subset \mathbb{A}_k^1$ of $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. It is obvious that the restriction of a rigid analytic function on an affinoid domain to a narrower affinoid domain is again rigid analytic, and hence one hopes that the rational neighbourhood in the definition of a holomorphic functional calculus is taken to be as small as possible.

5 Reductively Infinite Operator

To begin with, we dealt with a reductively infinite operator. A reductively infinite operator has the non-compact spectrum, and hence Vishik's non-Archimedean analogue of Riesz functional calculus in [Vis] does not work here. We verify that a reductively infinite operator generates the closed subalgebra isomorphic to the Tate algebra, and hence the holomorphic functional calculus works.

Definition 5.1. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a Banach k-algebra. An element $A \in \mathscr{A}$ is said to be reductively infinite if $\|A\| \in |k^\times|$ and if the spectrum $\sigma_{\tilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{a^{-1}A}) \subset \tilde{C}$ of its normal reduction $\overline{a^{-1}A} \in \tilde{\mathscr{A}}$ is an infinite set for an element $a \in k^\times$ with $\|A\| = |a|$.*

The cardinality of $\sigma_{\tilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{a^{-1}A})$ is independent of the choice of $a \in k^\times$ with $\|A\| = |a|$. Indeed, for elements $a, b \in k^\times$ with $\|A\| = |a| = |b|$, the multiplication by $\overline{ab^{-1}} \in \tilde{k}$ induces the bijection $\sigma_{\tilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{a^{-1}A}) \to \sigma_{\tilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{b^{-1}A})$.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a Banach k-algebra and $A \in \mathscr{A}$ a reductively infinite element. Then the k-algebra homomorphism $k[T] \to \mathscr{A} \colon T \mapsto A$ induces the isometric isomorphism $i_A \colon k\{T\} \to \mathscr{L}_A$ sending T to A.*

Proof. To begin with, we prove $\|F(A)\| = 1$ for a polynomial $F \in k^{\circ}[T] \subset k\{T\}$ with $\|F\| = 1$ with respect to the Gauss norm $\|\cdot\|$ of $k\{T\}$. Since $F \in k^{\circ}[T]$, one has $\|F(A)\| \leq 1$. The equality $\|F\| = 1$ implies that the reduction $\overline{F} \in k\{T\}^{\sim} = \widetilde{k}[T]$ is non-trivial. The condition that A is reductively infinite guarantees that $\overline{F(A)} = \overline{F}(\overline{A}) \neq 0 \in \widetilde{\mathscr{A}}$. Indeed, assume $\overline{F}(\overline{A}) = 0$. The non-trivial polynomial $\overline{F} \in \widetilde{k}[T]$ has at most finitely many zeros, and hence there is an element $\alpha \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) \subset \widetilde{C}$ such that $\overline{F}(\alpha) \neq 0 \in \widetilde{C}$. Set

$$\overline{G} := \frac{\overline{F}(T) - \overline{F}(\alpha)}{T - \alpha} \in \widetilde{C}[T].$$

One has

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \left(-\overline{F}(\alpha)\right)^{-1}\left(-\overline{F}(\alpha)\right) = -\overline{F}(\alpha)^{-1}\left(\overline{F}(\overline{A}) - \overline{F}(\alpha)\right) \\ &= -\overline{F}(\alpha)^{-1}\overline{G}(\overline{A})\left(\overline{A} - \alpha\right) \in \widetilde{\mathscr{A}} \otimes_{\widetilde{k}} \widetilde{C}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $\overline{A} - \alpha \in (\widetilde{\mathscr{A}} \otimes_{\widetilde{k}} \widetilde{C})^{\times}$. It contradicts the condition $\alpha \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$. Thus $\overline{F(A)} = \overline{F}(\overline{A}) \neq 0 \in \widetilde{\mathscr{A}}$. It follows that $\|F(A)\| = 1$.

Now take a polynomial $F \in k[T]$ and suppose $\|F(A)\| \leq 1$. Assume $F \notin k^{\circ}[T]$. Then there is an element $a \in k \backslash k^{\circ}$ such that $\|F\| = |a|$. One has $\|a^{-1}F\| = |a|^{-1}\|F\| = 1$ and hence $a^{-1}F \in k^{\circ}[T]$. On the other hand, the inequality $\|(a^{-1}F)(A)\| = |a^{-1}|\|F(A)\| \leq |a^{-1}| < 1$ implies that $\overline{a^{-1}F(A)} = 0 \in \widetilde{\mathscr{A}}$, and it contradicts the fact we proved above. Thus $F \in k^{\circ}[T]$.

Finally take a non-trivial polynomial $F \in k[T]$. For an element $a \in k^{\times}$ with $\|F\| = |a|$, one has $\|(a^{-1}F)(A)\| = 1$ and therefore $\|F(A)\| = |a|\|(a^{-1}F)(A)\| = |a| = \|F\|$. It follows that $k[T] \to \mathscr{A} \colon T \mapsto A$ is an isometry with respect to the Gauss norm $\|\cdot\|$ of $k\{T\}$, and hence it induces the isometry $i_A \colon k\{T\} \to \mathscr{A}$. Since $k[T] \subset k\{T\}$ is a dense k-subalgebra, the image of i_A is contained and dense in $\mathscr{L}_A$. The image of a closed subset by an isometry between complete metric spaces is complete, and hence is again closed. Therefore the image of i_A coincides with $\mathscr{L}_A \subset \mathscr{A}$. One has obtained the isometric isomorphism $i_A \colon k\{T\} \to \mathscr{L}_A$. □

Corollary 5.3. *A reductively infinite element $A \in \mathscr{A}$ admits the holomorphic functional calculus $i_A \colon H^0(\|A\|D^1_k, \mathbb{G}_a) \to \mathscr{A}$, where $\|A\|D^1_k \subset \mathbb{A}^1_k$ is the strictly k-affinoid domain $\mathscr{M}_k(k\{\|A\|^{-1}T\}) \subset \mathbb{A}^1_k$.*

Corollary 5.4. *For a countable index set I, a reductively transcendental operator $A \in \mathscr{B}_k(C_0(I,k))$ admits the holomorphic functional calculus $i_A \colon H^0(\|A\|D^1_k, \mathbb{G}_a) \to \mathscr{B}_k(C_0(I,k))$.*

Corollary 5.5. *Let $\rho \colon \mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ be a normalisable k-Banach representation. For an element $A \in \mathscr{A}$, if $\|A\| \leq \|\rho(A)\|$ and if $\rho(A)$ is reductively transcendental operator on V, A admits the holomorphic functional calculus $i_A \colon H^0(\|A\|D^1_k, \mathbb{G}_a) \to \mathscr{A}$.*

Example 5.6. *Suppose k is a complete discrete valuation field. Let $A \in \mathscr{A} := \mathscr{B}_k(C_0(\mathbb{Z},k))$ be the shift operator $(Af)(z) = f(z+1)$. Its matrix presentation M with respect to the* *canonical orthonormal Schauder basis is*

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & ⋰ \\ \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ ⋰ & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

where the diagonal is the line with 0*'s right lower than the line with* 1*'s. It is obvious that* A *is unitary, and hence one has* $\|A\| = 1$ *and* $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset (k^{\circ})^{\times}$*. Its normal reduction* $\overline{A} \in \widetilde{\mathscr{A}}$ *coincides with the matrix reduction* $\overline{A} \in \mathscr{B}_{\widetilde{k}}(\widetilde{k}^{\oplus \mathbb{Z}})$ *by Proposition 3.9, and the matrix reduction is the shift operator* $\overline{A}e_n = e_{n-1}$*, where* $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ *is the canonical basis of* $\widetilde{k}^{\oplus \mathbb{Z}}$*. The spectrum of the algebraic shift operator* $\overline{A}$ *coincides with* $\widetilde{k}^{\times}$*, and hence one has* $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) = (k^{\circ})^{\times}$ *by Proposition 3.4. Therefore if* $\widetilde{k}$ *is an infinite field, then* A *and* A^{-1} *are reductively infinite. Applying the holomorphic functional calculus to both* A *and* A^{-1}*, one obtains the holomorphic functional calculus*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \iota_A \colon k\{T, T^{-1}\} & \to & \mathscr{A} \\ F = \displaystyle\sum_{I \in \mathbb{Z}} F_I T^I & \mapsto & F(A) = \displaystyle\sum_{I \in \mathbb{Z}} F_I A^I. \end{array}$$

For a rigid analytic function $F \in k\{T, T^{-1}\}$*, the matrix presentation* $F(M)$ *of the substitution* $\iota_A(F) = F(A)$ *is*

$$F(M) = \begin{pmatrix} \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & ⋰ \\ \cdots & F_0 & F_1 & F_2 & F_3 & \cdots \\ \cdots & F_{-1} & F_0 & F_1 & F_2 & \cdots \\ \cdots & F_{-2} & F_{-1} & F_0 & F_1 & \cdots \\ \cdots & F_{-3} & F_{-2} & F_{-1} & F_0 & \cdots \\ ⋰ & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}$$

and this result is analogous to the theory of Fourier development of a function on $[0, 1]$.

Example 5.7. *Suppose* k *is a complete discrete valuation field. Let* $A \in \mathscr{A} := \mathscr{B}_k(C_0(\mathbb{N}, k))$ *be the Toepliz operator* $(Af)(z) = f(z + 1)$*. Its matrix presentation* M *with respect to the canonical orthonormal Schauder basis is*

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

where the order of $\mathbb{N}$ is given as the positive direction. It is obvious that $\|A\| = 1$ and $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset k^{\circ}$. Its normal reduction $\overline{A} \in \widetilde{\mathscr{A}}$ coincides with the matrix reduction $\overline{A} \in \mathscr{B}_{\widetilde{k}}(\widetilde{k}^{\oplus \mathbb{Z}})$ by Proposition 3.9, and the matrix reduction is the same Toepliz operator $\overline{A}e_n = e_{n-1}$, where $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is the canonical basis of $\widetilde{k}^{\oplus \mathbb{Z}}$. The spectrum of the algebraic Toepliz operator $\overline{A}$ coincides with $\widetilde{k}$, and hence one has $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) = k^{\circ}$ by Proposition 3.4. Therefore if $\widetilde{k}$ is an infinite field, then A is reductively infinite. Applying the holomorphic functional calculus to A, one obtains the holomorphic functional calculus

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \iota_A \colon k\{T\} & \to & \mathscr{A} \\ F = \displaystyle\sum_{I \in \mathbb{N}} F_I T^I & \mapsto & F(A) = \displaystyle\sum_{I \in \mathbb{N}} F_I A^I. \end{array}$$

For a rigid analytic function $F \in k\{T\}$, the matrix presentation $F(M)$ of the substitution $\iota_A(F) = F(A)$ is

$$F(M) = \begin{pmatrix} F_0 & F_1 & F_2 & F_3 & \cdots \\ 0 & F_0 & F_1 & F_2 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & F_0 & F_1 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & F_0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}$$

and it is easy to see that the functional calculus is continuously extended to the rigid analytic functions $k^{\circ}[[T]] \otimes_{k^{\circ}} k$ on the open unit disc with respect to the Frechet topology of $k^{\circ}[[T]] \otimes_{k^{\circ}} k$ and the weak topology, i.e. the topology of pointwise convergences, of $\mathscr{A}$.

Note that both examples do not need the assumption of the infiniteness of the residue field, because the restriction of the scalar works after the base change by a suitable extension of complete valuation fields. Such a base change technique is valid for analytic or algebraic functions, but not for continuous functions.

6 Reductively Finite Operator

In the last section, we dealt with a reductively infinite operator. As we showed, the normal reduction of a reductively infinite operator A has sufficient information about the structure of the commutative Banach algebra $\mathscr{L}_A$, and the holomorphic functional analysis works. On the other hand, a reductively finite operator possesses few information in its normal reduction and its matrix reduction. For example, there is an operator of operator norm 1 such that its matrix reduction is zero, as we mentioned at Proposition 3.9. Such an example does not exist for finite dimensional matrices, and this difficulty occurs only when we consider a reductively finite operator on an infinite dimensional Banach space.

Definition 6.1. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a Banach k-algebra. An element $A \in \mathscr{A}$ is said to be reductively finite if $\|A\| \in |k^{\times}|$ and if the spectrum $\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{a^{-1}A}) \subset \widetilde{k}$ of its normal reduction $\overline{a^{-1}A} \in \widetilde{\mathscr{A}}$ is a finite set for an element $a \in k^{\times}$ with $\|A\| = |a|$.*

Example 6.2. *For an extension K/k of non-Archimedean fields, a non-zero matrix $M \in M_n(K)$ is reductively finite if and only if the norm of each entry is contained in $|k|$. If K/k is not algebraic extension such as the complete fractional field of $k\{T\}$ and the non-strict k-affinoid field $k\{r^{-1}T, rT^{-1}\}$ for $r \in (0,\infty)\backslash|k^{\times}|$, the spectrum of the normal reduction $\overline{M}$ might be empty even if $\|M\| \in |k^{\times}|$.*

Definition 6.3. *A matrix $M \in M_n(k)$ is said to be k-valued if each eigenvalue of M is contained in k.*

Definition 6.4. *For a k-valued matrix $M \in M_n(k)$, define the family $\Sigma(M)$ in the following way: Since M is k-valued, the spectrum $\sigma_{M_n(k)}(M)$ is non-empty. For elements $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \sigma_{M_n(k)}(M)$, we write $\lambda_1 \sim \lambda_2$ if $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| < \|M\|$. The binary relation $\sim$ is obviously an equivalence relation on the ultrametric space $\sigma_{\mathrm{M}_n(k)}(M) \subset k$, and set $\Sigma(M) := \sigma_{M_n(k)}(M)/\sim$.*

For a matrix, the criterion of the unitarity, Proposition 4.2, guarantees the compatibility of the reductions and the spectra. See also Proposition 4.22.

Proposition 6.5. *For a non-zero k-valued matrix $M \in M_n(k)\backslash\{0\}$ and $a \in k^{\times}$ with $\|M\| = |a|$, the canonical homeomorphism $\sigma_{M_n(k)}(M) \to \sigma_{M_n(k)}(a^{-1}M) \subset k^{\circ}$ and the canonical projection $k^{\circ} \twoheadrightarrow \widetilde{k}$ induces a bijective map $\Sigma(M) \to \sigma_{M_n(\widetilde{k})}(\overline{a^{-1}M})$.*

Proof. Replacing M by $a^{-1}M$ for a suitable element $a \in k^{\times}$, we may and do assume $\|M\| = 1$ without loss of generality. For a spectrum $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathrm{M}_n(k)}(M) \subset k^{\circ}$, one has $M - \lambda \notin \mathrm{GL}_n(k)$ and in particular $M - \lambda \notin \mathrm{GL}_n(k^{\circ})$. It follows $\overline{\lambda} \in \sigma_{\mathrm{M}_n(\widetilde{k})}(\overline{M})$ by Proposition 3.4. Therefore the projection $k^{\circ} \twoheadrightarrow \widetilde{k}$ induces a canonical map $\Sigma(M) \to \sigma_{\mathrm{M}_n(\widetilde{k})}(\overline{M})$, which is obviously injective by the definition of $\sim$. In order to prove the surjectivity, assume there is a reductive spectrum $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\mathrm{M}_n(\widetilde{k})}(\overline{M})$ such that Λ is not contained in the image of $\Sigma(M)$, i.e. $\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathrm{M}_n(k)}(M) = \emptyset$ regarding Λ as a subset of k° by the set-theoretical tautology. Take any representative $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Since $\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathrm{M}_n(k)}(M) = \emptyset$, one has $M - \lambda \in \mathrm{GL}_n(k)$. Let $P \in k[T]$ be the characteristic polynomial of $M - \lambda$. The condition $\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathrm{M}_n(k)}(M) = \emptyset$ guarantees that $k^{\circ} \cap \sigma_{\mathrm{M}_n(k)}(M - \lambda) = \emptyset$ and hence $|\det(M - \lambda)| = |P(0)| = 1$. It follows $M - \lambda \in \mathrm{GL}_n(k^{\circ})$ by Proposition 4.2, and therefore $\overline{M} - \Lambda = \overline{M} - \overline{\lambda} \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\widetilde{k})$ by Proposition 3.4. It contradicts the assumption $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\mathrm{M}_n(\widetilde{k})}(\overline{M})$, and hence the map $\Sigma(M) \to \sigma_{\mathrm{M}_n(\widetilde{k})}(\overline{M})$ is surjective. $\square$

A reductively scalar matrix, Definition 3.15, is always reductively diagonalisable, but there are trivial examples of reductive scalar matrices which are not diagonalisable. To begin with, we prepare the method of removing reductively scalar matrices.

Lemma 6.6. *For a matrix $M = (M_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^{n} \in M_n(k)$, the matrix $M - M_{1,1}$ is reductively scalar if and only if M is scalar.*

Proof. Obvious because the $(1,1)$-entry of $M - M_{1,1}$ is 0. $\square$

Avoiding the case a matrix is reductively scalar before running the matrix reduction by the method above, one obtains a criterion of unitary diagonalisability of it.

Theorem 6.7. *A k-valued non-scalar matrix $M = (M_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^{n} \in M_n(k) \backslash k$ is unitarily diagonalisable if and only if $M - M_{1,1}$ is reductively diagonalisable and the matrix presentation of the restriction of the operator M on the M-stable subspace* $\ker \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda}(M - M_{1,1} - \lambda)^n \subset k^n$ *with respect to an orthonormal basis is unitarily diagonalisable for any* $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$.

Note that by [BGR], 2.5.1/5, any subspace of k^n is a strictly Cartesian normed k-vector space and admits an orthonormal basis. By Lemma 6.6, if M is a non-scalar unitarily diagonalisable matrix, one has $\#\Sigma(M - M_{1,1}) > 1$ and the subspace $\ker \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda}(M - M_{1,1} - \lambda)^n = \ker \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda}(M - M_{1,1} - \lambda) \subset k^n$ is a proper subspace for each $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$. The restriction of M on the M-stable subspace corresponding to a reductive spectrum $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$ is again k-valued because its minimal polynomial has roots only in $\Lambda \subset k$. Hence Theorem 6.7 surely gives the algorithm giving a criterion of unitary diagonalisability.

Proof. For each family $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$, denote by V_Λ the M-stable subspace $\ker \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda}(M - M_{1,1} - \lambda)^n \subset k^n$. Take an element $a \in k^\times$ with $\|M - M_{1,1}\| = |a|$.

To begin with, suppose M is unitarily diagonalisable. Take a unitary matrix $U \in \mathrm{GL}_n(k^\circ)$ such that $U^{-1}TU$ is a non-scalar diagonal matrix $\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)$. One has

$$\max{}_{i=1}^{n} |\lambda_i - M_{1,1}| = \|\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1 - M_{1,1}, \ldots, \lambda_n - M_{1,1})\| = \|U^{-1}(M - M_{1,1})U\| = \|M - M_{1,1}\| = |a|.$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned} & U^{-1}\frac{M - M_{1,1}}{a}U = \mathrm{diag}\left(\frac{\lambda_1 - M_{1,1}}{a}, \ldots, \frac{\lambda_n - M_{1,1}}{a}\right) \\ \therefore \quad & \overline{U}^{-1}\overline{\frac{M - M_{1,1}}{a}}\,\overline{U} = \overline{U^{-1}\frac{M - M_{1,1}}{a}U} = \overline{\mathrm{diag}\left(\frac{\lambda_1 - M_{1,1}}{a}, \ldots, \frac{\lambda_n - M_{1,1}}{a}\right)} \\ = \quad & \mathrm{diag}\left(\overline{\frac{\lambda_1 - M_{1,1}}{a}}, \ldots, \overline{\frac{\lambda_n - M_{1,1}}{a}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and $M - M_{1,1}$ is reductively diagonalisable. Take a family $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$. Now columns of the unitary matrix ${}^{t}U^{-1}$ form an orthonormal basis of k^n consisting of eigenvectors of M. Let $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in k^n$ be the distinct eigenvectors belonging to the eigenvalues contained in Λ. Since M is diagonalisable, one has $V_\Lambda = \ker \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda}(M - M_{1,1} - \lambda)$ and hence $u_1, \ldots, u_m$ is an orthonormal basis of V_Λ. The matrix presentation of the restriction of the operator M on V_Λ is the m-dimensional diagonal matrix whose entries are the eigenvalues contained in Λ corresponding to $u_1, \ldots, u_m$, and hence is unitarily diagonalisable.

On the other hand, suppose $M - M_{1,1}$ is reductively diagonalisable and the matrix presentation of the restriction of the operator M on the V_Λ with respect to an orthonormal basis is unitarily diagonalisable for any $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$. For each $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$, take a non-zero vector $v_\Lambda \in V_\Lambda \backslash \{0\}$. We verify that the vectors v_Λ's form an orthogonal system. Take a linear combination

$$v = \sum_{\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})} b_\Lambda v_\Lambda, b_\Lambda \in k,$$

and assume $\|v\| < \max_{\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})} |b_\Lambda| \|v_\Lambda\|$. In particular it is a non-trivial linear combination. Fix elements $c_\Lambda \in k^\times$ with $|c_\Lambda| = \|v_\Lambda\|$ for each $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$. Multiplying an appropriate scalar, we may and do assume $b_\Lambda c_\Lambda \in k^\circ$ for any $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$ and $|b_\Lambda c_\Lambda| = 1$ for some $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$. Set $v'_\Lambda := c_\Lambda^{-1} v_\Lambda$ for each $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$. Then one has

$$\|v\| < \max_{\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})} |b_\Lambda| \|v_\Lambda\| = \max_{\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})} |b_\Lambda c_\Lambda| = 1$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \overline{v} = \overline{\sum_{\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})} b_\Lambda v_\Lambda} = \overline{\sum_{\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})} (b_\Lambda c_\Lambda) v'_\Lambda} \\ &= \sum_{\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})} \overline{b_\Lambda c_\Lambda v'_\Lambda} \in \widetilde{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the equality $|a| = \|M - M_{1,1}\|$ implies $|a^{-1}\lambda| \leq 1$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$. Since $M - M_{1,1}$ is reductively diagonalisable, the reduction $\overline{a^{-1}(M - M_{1,1})} \in \mathrm{M}_n(\widetilde{k})$ is diagonalisable, and the minimal polynomial of $\overline{a^{-1}(M - M_{1,1})}$ is reduced. On the other hand, one has

$$0 = \overline{\left(\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left(\frac{M - M_{1,1}}{a} - \frac{\lambda}{a} \right)^n \right) v'_\Lambda} = \left(\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left(\overline{\frac{M - M_{1,1}}{a}} - \overline{\frac{\lambda}{a}} \right)^n \right) \overline{v'_\Lambda} = \left(\overline{\frac{M - M_{1,1}}{a}} - \overline{\frac{\lambda_\Lambda}{a}} \right)^{n\#\Lambda} \overline{v'_\Lambda}$$

for a representative $\lambda_\Lambda \in \Lambda$, and it follows

$$\left(\overline{\frac{M - M_{1,1}}{a}} - \overline{\frac{\lambda_\Lambda}{a}} \right) \overline{v'_\Lambda} = 0.$$

Therefore $\overline{v'_\Lambda} \in \widetilde{k}^n$ is an eigenvector of $\overline{a^{-1}(M - M_{1,1})} \in \mathrm{M}_n(\widetilde{k})$ belonging to the eigenvalue $\overline{a^{-1}\lambda_\Lambda} \in \widetilde{k}$. Note that $\overline{a^{-1}\lambda_\Lambda}$ is independent of the choice of the representative $\lambda_\Lambda \in \Lambda$ by the definition of $\Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$. Take an well-order $\Lambda_1 < \cdots < \Lambda_{\#\Sigma(M - M_{1,1})}$ on $\Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$, and rearranging the order, we may and do assume there is an integer $0 \leq m \leq \#\Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$ such that $|b_{\Lambda_1} c_{\Lambda_1}| = \cdots = |b_{\Lambda_m} c_{\Lambda_m}| = 1$ and $1 > |b_{\Lambda_{m+1}} c_{\Lambda_{m+1}}| \geq \cdots \geq |b_{\Lambda_{\#\Sigma(M - M_{1,1})}} c_{\Lambda_{\#\Sigma(M - M_{1,1})}}|$. In fact, the assumption that there is some $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$ such that $|b_\Lambda c_\Lambda| = 1$ guarantees $m \geq 1$. For each $i = 0, \ldots, m - 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^{m} \left(\overline{\frac{\lambda_{\Lambda_j}}{a}} \right)^i \overline{b_{\Lambda_j} c_{\Lambda_j} v'_{\Lambda_j}} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left(\overline{\frac{M - M_{1,1}}{a}} \right)^i \overline{b_{\Lambda_j} c_{\Lambda_j} v'_{\Lambda_j}} = \left(\overline{\frac{M - M_{1,1}}{a}} \right)^i \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \overline{b_{\Lambda_j} c_{\Lambda_j} v'_{\Lambda_j}} \right) \\ = &\left(\overline{\frac{M - M_{1,1}}{a}} \right)^i \overline{\sum_{j=1}^{m} b_{\Lambda_j} v_{\Lambda_j}} = \left(\overline{\frac{M - M_{1,1}}{a}} \right)^i \overline{\sum_{j=1}^{\#\Sigma(M - M_{1,1})} b_{\Lambda_j} v_{\Lambda_j}} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \overline{v'_{\Lambda_1}} & \overline{v'_{\Lambda_2}} & \cdots & \overline{v'_{\Lambda_m}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \overline{b_{\Lambda_1}c_{\Lambda_1}} & \overline{b_{\Lambda_1}c_{\Lambda_1}}\,\overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_1}} & \cdots & \overline{b_{\Lambda_1}c_{\Lambda_1}}\,\overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_1}}^{m-1} \\ \overline{b_{\Lambda_2}c_{\Lambda_2}} & \overline{b_{\Lambda_2}c_{\Lambda_2}}\,\overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_2}} & \cdots & \overline{b_{\Lambda_2}c_{\Lambda_2}}\,\overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_2}}^{m-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \overline{b_{\Lambda_m}c_{\Lambda_m}} & \overline{b_{\Lambda_m}c_{\Lambda_m}}\,\overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_m}} & \cdots & \overline{b_{\Lambda_m}c_{\Lambda_m}}\,\overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_m}}^{m-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \overline{v'_{\Lambda_1}} & \overline{v'_{\Lambda_2}} & \cdots & \overline{v'_{\Lambda_m}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \overline{b_{\Lambda_1}c_{\Lambda_1}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{b_{\Lambda_2}c_{\Lambda_2}} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \overline{b_{\Lambda_m}c_{\Lambda_m}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_1}} & \cdots & \overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_1}}^{m-1} \\ 1 & \overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_2}} & \cdots & \overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_2}}^{m-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_m}} & \cdots & \overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_m}}^{m-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\overline{b_{\Lambda_1}c_{\Lambda_1}}, \ldots, \overline{b_{\Lambda_m}c_{\Lambda_m}} \neq 0$ by the definition of $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and since $\overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_1}}, \ldots, \overline{a^{-1}\lambda_{\Lambda_m}} \in \widetilde{k}$ are distinct by the definition of $\Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$, the right two matrices on the right hand side are invertible. Therefore one obtains $\overline{v'_{\Lambda_1}} = \cdots = \overline{v'_{\Lambda_m}} = 0 \in \widetilde{k}^n$. The inequality $m \geq 1$ surely guarantees $\overline{v'_{\Lambda_1}} = 0 \in \widetilde{k}^n$, but it contradicts the fact $\|v'_{\Lambda_1}\| = \|c_{\Lambda_1}^{-1}v_{\Lambda_1}\| = |c_{\Lambda_1}|^{-1}\|v_{\Lambda_1}\| = 1$. We conclude that $\|v\| = \max_{\Lambda \in \Sigma(M-M_{1,1})} |b_\Lambda| \|v_\Lambda\|$, and $v_{\Lambda_1}, \ldots, v_{\Lambda_{\#\Sigma(M-M_{1,1})}}$ form an orthogonal system. Therefore V_Λ's are orthogonal.

Now considering the decomposition of k^n into the generalised eigenspaces of the k-valued matrix $M - M_{1,1}$, one obtains

$$k^n = \bigoplus_{\Lambda \in \Sigma(M-M_{1,1})} V_\Lambda.$$

The assumption that the matrix presentation of the restriction of the operator M on V_Λ with respect to an orthogonal basis is unitarily diagonalisable guarantees that the subspace $V_\lambda \subset k^n$ admits an orthonormal basis $e_{\Lambda,1}, \ldots, e_{\Lambda,\dim_k V_\Lambda}$ consisting of eigenvectors of M for each $\Lambda \in \Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$. We verify that the system $e_{\Lambda_1,1}, \ldots, e_{\Lambda_{\#\Sigma(M-M_{1,1})},\dim_k V_{\Lambda_{\#\Sigma(M-M_{1,1})}}}$ forms an orthonormal basis of k^n. Obviously it is a basis consisting of vectors with norm 1, and hence it suffices to show that it is an orthogonal system. Take a linear combination

$$v = \sum_{j=1}^{\#\Sigma(M-M_{1,1})} \sum_{i=1}^{\dim_k V_{\Lambda_j}} b_{\Lambda_j,i} e_{\Lambda_j,i}, b_{\Lambda_j,i} \in k.$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^{\dim_k V_{\Lambda_j}} b_{\Lambda_j,i} e_{\Lambda_j,i} \in V_{\Lambda_j}$ for each $1 \leq j \leq \#\Sigma(M - M_{1,1})$, the orthogonality of V_Λ's implies

$$\|v\| = \max{}_{j=1}^{\#\Sigma(M-M_{1,1})} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\dim_k V_{\Lambda_j}} b_{\Lambda_j,i} e_{\Lambda_j,i} \right\|,$$

and the orthonormality of $e_{\Lambda_j,1}, \ldots, e_{\Lambda_j,\dim_k V_{\Lambda_j}}$ guarantees

$$\|v\| = \max_{j=1}^{\#\Sigma(M-M_{1,1})} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\dim_k V_{\Lambda_j}} b_{\Lambda_j,i} e_{\Lambda_j,i} \right\| = \max_{j=1}^{\#\Sigma(M-M_{1,1})} \max_{i=1}^{\dim_k V_{\Lambda_j}} |b_{\Lambda_j,i}|.$$

Thus the system $e_{\Lambda_1,1}, \ldots, e_{\Lambda_{\#\Sigma(M-M_{1,1})},\dim_k V_{\Lambda_{\#\Sigma(M-M_{1,1})}}}$ forms an orthonormal basis of k^n. Since k^n admits an orthonormal basis consisting of eigenvectors of M, the matrix M is unitarily diagonalisable. □

The result for matrices is easily extended to the criterion of the admissibility of the continuous functional calculus of a reductively finite operator on an infinite dimensional Banach space.

Proposition 6.8. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a Banach k-algebra. If a reductively finite element $A \in \mathscr{A}$ with $\|A\| = 1$ admits the reductive functional calculus, then there is a canonical system $(P_{A,\Lambda})_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})} \in \mathscr{A}^{\sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})}$ of idempotents satisfying the following:*

(i) $\sum_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})} P_{A,\Lambda}(A) = 1.$

(ii) $P_{A,\Lambda} P_{A,\Lambda'} = 0$ *for any distinct reductive spectra* $\Lambda \neq \Lambda'$*;*

(iii) $\|P_{A,\Lambda}\| = 1$ *for any* $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$*;*

(iv) $P_{A,\Lambda} A = A P_{A,\Lambda}$ *for any* $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$*; and*

(v)

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(P_{A,\Lambda} A) &= \begin{cases} (\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)) \cup \{0\} & (\#\sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) > 1) \\ \Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) = \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) & (\#\sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) = 1) \end{cases} \\ \sigma_{(P_{A,\Lambda})}(P_{A,\Lambda} A) &= \Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), \end{aligned}$$

where $(P_{A,\Lambda}) \subset \mathscr{A}$ *is the closure of the subset* $P_{A,\Lambda} \mathscr{A} P_{A,\Lambda} \subset A$*, for any* $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$*.*

In other words, there is a canonical partition of unity corresponding to the decomposition of the spectrum by the discrete reductive spectrum.

Note that $(P_{A,\Lambda}) \subset \mathscr{A}$ is not a k-subalgebra of $\mathscr{A}$ because it does not contain $1 \in \mathscr{A}$ when $\#\sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) > 1$, but is a unital Banach k-algebra whose identity is $P_{A,\Lambda}$. For an element $B \in \mathscr{A}$ commuting with $P_{A,\Lambda}$, one has $P_{A,\Lambda} B P_{A,\Lambda} = P_{A,\Lambda}^2 B = P_{A,\Lambda} B$ and hence we use the presentation $P_{A,\Lambda} B$ rather than $P_{A,\Lambda} B P_{A,\Lambda}$ even when we regard it as an element of $P_{A,\Lambda} \mathscr{A} P_{A,\Lambda} \subset (P_{A,\Lambda})$. In particular the structure homomorphism $k \to (P_{A,\Lambda})$ sends an element $a \in k$ to $P_{A,\Lambda} a \in (P_{A,\Lambda})$. Be careful that $P_{A,\Lambda} \in \mathscr{A}$ is not a central idempotent in general, and hence the canonical projection $\mathscr{A} \to (P_{A,\Lambda}) \colon B \mapsto P_{A,\Lambda} B P_{A,\Lambda}$ is not necessarily a k-algebra homomorphism. Therefore the inclusion $\sigma_{(P_{A,\Lambda})}(P_{A,\Lambda} A) \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(P_{A,\Lambda} A)$ is not obvious.

Proof. Since A admits the reductive functional calculus, the reductive spectrum $\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) \subset \widetilde{k}$ is not empty. If $\#\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) = 1$, set $P_{A,\Lambda} := 1 \in \mathscr{A}$ for the unique reductive spectrum $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$. Then the conditions (i)-(v) are trivial. Note that $\mathscr{A}$ is non-zero because $\|A\| = 1$ and hence $\|1\| = 1$. Now we consider the case $\#\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) > 1$. Since A is reductively finite, one has $n := \#\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) < \infty$. Take a reductive spectrum $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$. Let $\Lambda = \overline{\lambda}_1, \ldots, \overline{\lambda}_n \in \widetilde{k}$ be the spectra of $\overline{A}$. Since A admits the reductive continuous functional calculus, one has the canonical injective $\widetilde{k}$-algebra homomorphism $\iota_{\overline{A}} \colon \widetilde{k}^{\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} \hookrightarrow \widetilde{A}$ sending the coordinate function $(\overline{\lambda_i})_{\overline{\lambda_i} \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} \in \widetilde{k}^{\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}$ to $\overline{A}$. Recall that the image of $\iota_{\overline{A}}$ is contained in $\mathscr{L}_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A}) = \mathscr{L}_{\overline{(A)}}$ by Proposition 4.21, and that $\mathscr{L}_{\overline{(A)}} = \widetilde{k}[\overline{A}] \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{L}_A}$. Take a lift $P \in \mathscr{L}_A(1)$ of the image $\iota_{\mathscr{A}}(1_\Lambda) \in \widetilde{A}$ of the characteristic function $1_\Lambda \in \widetilde{k}^{\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}$ of the singleton $\{\Lambda\} \subset \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})$. The equality $1_\Lambda^2 = 1_\Lambda$ guarantees that $\|P^2 - P\| < 1$. Inductively define the sequence $(x_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathscr{L}_A(1)^{\mathbb{N}}$ in the following way:

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_0 &:= P \\
x_{j+1} &:= 3x_j^2 - 2x_j^3, \ j \in \mathbb{N}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then for an integer $j \in \mathbb{N}$, one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{j+1}^2 - x_{j+1} &= (3x_j^2 - 2x_j^3)^2 - (3x_j^2 - 2x_j^3) = 4x_j^6 - 12x_j^5 + 9x_j^4 + 2x_j^3 - 3x_j^2 \\
&= (x_j^2 - x_j)(4x_j^4 - 8x_j^3 + x_j^2 + 3x_j) = (x_j^2 - x_j)(x_j^2 - x_j)(4x_j^2 - 4x_j - 3) \\
&= -(x_j^2 - x_j)^2 \left(3 - 4(x_j^2 - x_j)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence

$$
\left\|x_{j+1}^2 - x_{j+1}\right\| \leq \left\|x_j^2 - x_j\right\|^2 \leq \left\|P^2 - P\right\|^{2^{j+1}}.
$$

It follows that $\lim_{j \to \infty} \|x_j^2 - x_j\| = 0$. Moreover, the equalities

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{j+1} - x_j &= 3x_j^2 - 2x_j^3 - x_j = -x_j(x_j - 1)(2x_j - 1) \\
\|x_{j+1} - x_j\| &\leq \left\|x_j^2 - x_j\right\| \|2x_j - 1\| \leq \left\|x_j^2 - x_j\right\|
\end{aligned}
$$

imply that the sequence $(x_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathscr{A}(1)^{\mathbb{N}}$ converges to an element $P_\Lambda \in \mathscr{L}_A(1)$ by Proposition 2.8. By the continuity of the norm, the multiplication, and the addition, one has

$$
\left\|P_\Lambda^2 - P_\Lambda\right\| = \lim_{j \to \infty} \left\|x_j^2 - x_j\right\| = 0
$$

and therefore P_Λ^2 is an idempotent. Moreover P_Λ is non-zero. Indeed, for an integer $j \in \mathbb{N}$, it is easy to see that

$$
\|x_{j+1}\| = \left\|3x_j^2 - 2x_j^3\right\| = \left\|x_j + (x_j^2 - x_j)(-2x_j + 1)\right\| = \|x_j\| = \cdots = \|P\| = 1
$$

and hence

$$
\|P_\Lambda\| = \lim_{j \to \infty} \|x_j\| = 1
$$

by the continuity of the norm. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_\Lambda - P\| &= \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (x_{j+1} - x_j) \right\| \leq \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_{j+1} - x_j\| = \|x_1 - x_0\| \\ &= \left\| (3P^2 - 2P^3) - P \right\| = \| - P(P-1)(2P-1)\| \leq \|P^2 - P\| < 1, \end{aligned}$$

and hence $\overline{P_\Lambda} = \overline{P} = \iota_{\mathscr{A}}(1_\Lambda)$. Obviously it is independent of the choice of a lift P because the norm of any two distinct idempotent, which is again a non-zero idempotent by the commutativity, is not less than 1 by the same calculation above.

We have constructed the system $(P_\Lambda)_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})} \in \mathscr{L}_A^n$ of idempotents. By the argument above, the condition (iii) holds. Since $\mathscr{L}_A$ is a commutative Banach k-algebra, containing A, the condition (iv) holds. For distinct reductive spectrum $\Lambda, \Lambda' \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$, since $1_\Lambda 1_{\Lambda'} = 0 \in \widetilde{k}^{\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}$, one has

$$\overline{P_\Lambda P_{\Lambda'}} = \overline{P_\Lambda}\,\overline{P_{\Lambda'}} = \iota_{\widetilde{A}}(1_\Lambda)\iota_{\widetilde{A}}(1_{\Lambda'}) = \iota_{\widetilde{A}}(1_\Lambda 1_{\Lambda'}) = 0$$

and hence $\|P_\Lambda P_{\Lambda'}\| < 1$. On the other hand, since $\mathscr{L}_A$ is commutative, the product $P_\Lambda P_{\Lambda'}$ of idempotents is again an idempotent. It follows

$$\|P_\Lambda P_{\Lambda'}\| = \left\| (P_\Lambda P_{\Lambda'})^2 \right\| \leq \|P_\Lambda P_{\Lambda'}\|^2,$$

and $\|P_\Lambda P_{\Lambda'}\| = 0$. Therefore the condition (ii) holds. Moreover, since

$$\overline{\sum_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} P_\Lambda} = \sum_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} \overline{P_\Lambda} = \sum_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} \iota_{\widetilde{A}}(1_\Lambda) = \iota_{\mathscr{A}}(1) = 1 \neq 0 \in \widetilde{A},$$

one has $\|1 - \sum_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} P_\Lambda\| < 1$. The commutativity of $\mathscr{L}_A$ and the equality $P_\Lambda P_{\Lambda'} = 0$ for each two distinct reductive spectra $\Lambda, \Lambda' \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})$ guarantee that the difference $1 - \sum_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} P_\Lambda$ is again an idempotent, and hence coincides with 0 by the same argument for (ii). Therefore (i) holds. We verify the property (v). Take a reductive spectrum $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})$, and let $\Lambda = \overline{\lambda}_1, \ldots, \overline{\lambda}_n \in \widetilde{k}$ be the spectra of $\overline{A}$ again.

First, one has $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(P_\Lambda A) \subset k^\circ$ and $\sigma_{(P_\Lambda)}(P_\Lambda A) \subset k^\circ$ because $\|P_\Lambda A\| \leq \|A\| = 1$. Since $\#\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A}) > 1$, there is another reductive spectrum $\Lambda' \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})$. The equality $P_\Lambda P_{\Lambda'} = 0$ with $P_{\Lambda'} \neq 0$ guarantees that $P_\Lambda \notin \mathscr{A}^\times$, and hence $P_\Lambda A \notin \mathscr{A}^\times$. Therefore $0 \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(P_\Lambda A)$.

Secondly, take a resolvent $\lambda \in k^\circ \backslash \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. One has

$$(P_\Lambda A - P_\Lambda \lambda)(P_\Lambda (A - \lambda)^{-1} P_\Lambda) = P_\Lambda^3 = P_\Lambda \in (P_\Lambda)$$

and

$$(P_\Lambda (A - \lambda)^{-1} P_\Lambda)(P_\Lambda A - P_\Lambda \lambda) = P_\Lambda^3 = P_\Lambda \in (P_\Lambda)$$

because P_Λ and A commutes. Therefore $P_\Lambda A - P_\Lambda \lambda \in (P_\Lambda)^\times$ and $\lambda \in k^\circ \backslash \sigma_{(P_\Lambda)}(P_\Lambda A)$. In addition if $\lambda \neq 0$, one obtains

$$(P_\Lambda A - \lambda)\left(P_\Lambda (A - \lambda)^{-1} P_\Lambda + (1 - P_\Lambda)\lambda^{-1}\right)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= (P_\Lambda(A-\lambda) + (1-P_\Lambda)\lambda)\left(P_\Lambda(A-\lambda)^{-1}P_\Lambda + (1-P_\Lambda)\lambda^{-1}\right)\\
&= P_\Lambda^3 + P_\Lambda(1-P_\Lambda)(A-\lambda)\lambda^{-1} + (1-P_\Lambda)P_\Lambda\lambda(A-\lambda)^{-1}P_\Lambda A + (1-P_\Lambda)^2\\
&= P_\Lambda + 0 + 0 + (1-P_\Lambda) = 1,
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(P_\Lambda(A-\lambda)^{-1}P_\Lambda + (1-P_\Lambda)\lambda^{-1}\right)(P_\Lambda A - \lambda)\\
=\ &\left(P_\Lambda(A-\lambda)^{-1}P_\Lambda + (1-P_\Lambda)\lambda^{-1}\right)(P_\Lambda(A-\lambda) + (1-P_\Lambda)\lambda)\\
=\ &P_\Lambda^3 + P_\Lambda(A-\lambda)^{-1}P_\Lambda(1-P_\Lambda)\lambda + (1-P_\Lambda)P_\Lambda\lambda^{-1}(A-\lambda) + (1-P_\Lambda)^2\\
=\ &P_\Lambda + 0 + 0 + (1-P_\Lambda) = 1.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $P_\Lambda A - \lambda \in \mathscr{A}^\times$ and $\lambda \in k^\circ \backslash \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(P_\Lambda A)$.

Thirdly, take an element $\lambda \in k^\circ \backslash (\Lambda \cup \{0\})$. Since $\overline{\lambda} \neq \Lambda$, one has

$$
\overline{P_\Lambda A - \lambda} = \iota_{\overline{A}}\left(1_\Lambda\left(\overline{\lambda_i}\right)_{\overline{\lambda_i}\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} - \overline{\lambda}\right) = \iota_{\overline{A}}\left(\Lambda 1_\Lambda - \overline{\lambda}\right) \in \iota_{\overline{A}}\left(\left(\widetilde{k}^{\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})}\right)^\times\right) \subset \widetilde{\mathscr{A}}^\times,
$$

and hence $P_\Lambda A - \lambda \in \mathscr{A}(1)^\times$ by Proposition 3.4. It immediately follows that $\lambda \in k^\circ \backslash \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(P_\Lambda A)$, and the equalities

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(P_\Lambda A - P_\Lambda\lambda)P_\Lambda(P_\Lambda A-\lambda)^{-1}P_\Lambda = ((P_\Lambda A-\lambda) + (1-P_\Lambda)\lambda)P_\Lambda(P_\Lambda A-\lambda)^{-1}P_\Lambda\\
=\ &P_\Lambda^2 + (1-P_\Lambda)P_\Lambda\lambda(P_\Lambda A-\lambda)^{-1}P_\Lambda = P_\Lambda + 0 = P_\Lambda \in (P_\Lambda)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P_\Lambda(P_\Lambda A-\lambda)^{-1}P_\Lambda(P_\Lambda A - P_\Lambda\lambda) = P_\Lambda(P_\Lambda A-\lambda)^{-1}P_\Lambda((P_\Lambda A-\lambda) + (1-P_\Lambda)\lambda)\\
=\ &P_\Lambda^2 + P_\Lambda(P_\Lambda A-\lambda)^{-1}P_\Lambda(1-P_\Lambda)\lambda = P_\Lambda + 0 = P_\Lambda \in (P_\Lambda)
\end{aligned}
$$

imply $\lambda \in k^\circ \backslash \sigma_{(P_\Lambda)}(P_\Lambda A)$.

Finally, take a spectrum $\lambda \in \Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. Assume $\lambda \notin \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(P_\Lambda A)$. Then the argument above guarantees $\lambda \neq 0$ and the inverse $(P_\Lambda A - \lambda)^{-1} = (P_{\lambda_1} A - \lambda)^{-1} \in \mathscr{A}$ of $P_{\overline{\Lambda}} A - \lambda = P_{\overline{\lambda_1}} A - \lambda$ exists. By the calculation in the third case, one has $\lambda \in k^\circ \backslash \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(P_{\lambda_i} A)$ and hence the inverse $(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}} A - \lambda)^{-1} \in \mathscr{A}$ of $P_{\overline{\lambda_i}} A - \lambda$ exists for any $i = 2, \ldots, n$. The equalities

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(A-\lambda)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A-\lambda)^{-1}P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\right) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(A-\lambda)\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A-\lambda)^{-1}P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\right)\\
=\ &\left(\sum_{i=1}^n P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A-\lambda)\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A-\lambda)^{-1}P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\right)\\
=\ &\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}P_{\overline{\lambda_j}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A-\lambda)(P_{\overline{\lambda_j}}A-\lambda)^{-1}P_{\overline{\lambda_i}} = \sum_{i=1}^n P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n P_{\overline{\lambda_i}} = 1
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\left(\sum_{i=1}^n P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A-\lambda)^{-1}P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\right)(A-\lambda) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A-\lambda)^{-1}P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(A-\lambda)\right)
$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A - \lambda)^{-1} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A - \lambda)\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A - \lambda)^{-1} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}} P_{\overline{\lambda_j}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_j}}A - \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

imply $A - \lambda \in \mathscr{A}^{\times}$ and it contradicts the condition $\lambda \in \Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. Therefore $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(P_\Lambda A)$. Similarly assume $\lambda \notin \sigma_{(P_\Lambda)}(P_\Lambda A)$. Then the inverse $B_1 \in (P_\Lambda)$ of $P_\Lambda A - P_\Lambda \lambda = P_{\overline{\lambda_1}}A - P_{\overline{\lambda_1}}\lambda$ in $(P_\Lambda) = (P_{\overline{\lambda_1}})$ exists. By the calculation in the third case, one has $\lambda \in k^{\circ} \backslash \sigma_{(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}})}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A)$ and hence the inverse $B_i \in (P_{\overline{\lambda_i}})$ of $P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A - P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\lambda$ in $(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}})$ exists for any $i = 2, \ldots, n$. Namely, for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, one has

$$(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A - P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\lambda)B_i = B_i(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A - P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\lambda) = P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}.$$

Since $P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}$ and A commutes, one has

$$(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A - P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\lambda)P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}B_iP_{\overline{\lambda_i}} = P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A - P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\lambda)B_iP_{\overline{\lambda_i}} = P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}^3 = P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}$$

and

$$P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}B_iP_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A - P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\lambda) = P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}B(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A - P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\lambda)P_{\overline{\lambda_i}} = P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}^3 = P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}.$$

It follows $P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}B_iP_{\overline{\lambda_i}} = B_i$ by the uniqueness of the inverse in the unital ring $(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}})$. Now the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} (A - \lambda)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} B_i\right) &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(A - \lambda)\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}B_iP_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}P_{\overline{\lambda_j}}(A - \lambda)B_jP_{\overline{\lambda_j}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}^2(A - \lambda)B_iP_{\overline{\lambda_i}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n}(P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}A - P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\lambda)B_iP_{\overline{\lambda_i}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} B_i\right)(A - \lambda) &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}B_iP_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}(A - \lambda)\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}B_iP_{\overline{\lambda_i}}P_{\overline{\lambda_j}}(A - \lambda) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}B_iP_{\overline{\lambda_i}}^2(A - \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}B_i(P_{\overline{\lambda_j}}A - P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{\overline{\lambda_i}} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

imply that $A - \lambda \in \mathscr{A}^{\times}$, and it contradicts the condition $\lambda \in \Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. Therefore $\lambda \in \sigma_{(P_\Lambda)}(P_\Lambda A)$.

We conclude $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(P_{A,\Lambda}A) = (\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)) \cup \{0\}$ and $\sigma_{(P_{A,\Lambda})}(P_{A,\Lambda}A) = \Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. Thus the condition (v) holds. □

Note that the definition of the system $(P_{A,\Lambda})_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)}$ heavily depends not only on A but also on $\mathscr{A}$ because it uses the spectrum $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ of A in $\mathscr{A}$. In other words, if one replaces $\mathscr{A}$ by a Banach k-subalgebra containing A, the corresponding partition of unity might change in general. In order to avoid the complexity, we do not specify $\mathscr{A}$ in the system.

Definition 6.9. *A system* $(P_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathscr{A}^I$ *of idempotents indexed by a finite index set* I *is said to be a partition of unity if* $\sum_{i \in I} P_i = 1$ *and* $\|P_i\| = 1$ *for any* $i \in I$.

Example 6.10. *The system* $(P_{A,\Lambda})_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(A)}$ *in Proposition 6.8 is a partition of unity.*

Proposition 6.11. *A partition* $(P_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathscr{A}^I$ *of unity is a system of orthonormal projections, i.e. for any* $(c_i)_{i \in I} \in k^I$, *one has*

$$\left\| \sum_{i \in I} c_i P_i \right\| = \max_{i \in I} |c_i|.$$

Proof. Set $A \coloneqq \sum_{i \in I} c_i P_i$. The inequality $\|A\| \leq \max_{i \in I} |c_i|$ is obvious because $\|P_i\| = 1$ for any $i \in I$. Take an index $i \in I$ with $|c_i| = \max_{i' \in I} |c_{i'}|$. Then the equality

$$(A - c_i)P_i = \sum_{i' \in I} (c_{i'} - c_i) P_{i'} P_i = 0$$

guarantees that $A - c_i \notin \mathscr{A}^\times$, and hence $c_i \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. Therefore one has $\|A\| \geq |c_i| = \max_{i' \in I} |c_{i'}|$. □

Proposition 6.12. *Let* V *be a* k*-Banach space. A partition* $(P_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)^I$ *of unity satisfies the orthogonal property, i.e. for any* $v \in V$, *one has*

$$\|v\| = \max_{i \in I} \|P_i v\|.$$

In other words, it gives the decomposition

$$V = \oplus_{i \in I} P_i(V) = \oplus_{i \in I} \ker(1 - P_i)$$

as a k*-Banach space.*

Proof. The inequality $\leq$ is obvious by the definition of a partition of unity, and the opposite inequality $\geq$ follows from the condition $\|P_i\| = 1$. □

Now we obtain a direct analogue of Theorem 6.7. Suppose $\mathscr{A}$ is an operator algebra and A is an operator. Different from the matrix case, the following does not give a criterion for the normality of A because the induction on the dimension works only in the finite dimensional case.

Proposition 6.13. *In the situation in Proposition 6.8,* A *admits the continuous functional calculus in* $\mathscr{A}$ *if and only if* $P_{A,\Lambda} A$ *admits the continuous functional calculus in* $(P_{A,\Lambda}) \subset \mathscr{A}$ *for any reductive spectrum* $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})$.

Proof. To begin with, suppose A admits the continuous functional calculus

$$\iota_A \colon \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \to \mathscr{A}.$$

Since the partition $(P_{A,\Lambda})_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}$ of unity is a system of idempotents in $\mathscr{L}_A$, it is contained in the image of ι_A by the isometry of ι_A. Let $(E_\Lambda)_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}$ be the partition of unity in $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)$ which is the pre-image of $(P_{A,\Lambda})_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}$, and $(1_{\widetilde{\Lambda}})_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}$ the partition of unity in $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)$ consisting of the characteristic functions $1_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}$ of $\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ for reductive spectra $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})$. The isometry of ι_A guarantees that $\|E_\Lambda\| = \|P_{A,\Lambda}\| = 1$ for any $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})$. By the uniqueness of continuous functional calculus, it is compatible with the normal reduction, and hence one has $\overline{E_\Lambda} = 1_\Lambda = 1_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}$ by the construction of $P_{A,\Lambda}$ for any $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})$. Therefore $\|E_\Lambda - 1_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}\| < 1$. Since $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)$ is commutative, the difference $E_\Lambda - 1_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}$ of idempotents is again an idempotent, and hence is 0 by the same calculation as that in the proof of Proposition 6.8. It follows that $(E_\Lambda)_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}$ is the partition of unity in $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)$ consisting of the characteristic functions of $\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ for reductive spectra $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})$. It is obvious that the restriction $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \to \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)$ induces the isometric isomorphism $(E_\Lambda) \to \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)$ of commutative unital uniform Banach k-algebras, and its inverse is the restriction $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \to (E_\Lambda)$ of the non-unital k-algebra homomorphism $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \to \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \colon f \mapsto E_\Lambda f$. Therefore one obtains the continuous functional calculus

$$\iota_{P_{A,\Lambda}A} \colon \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma_{(P_{A,\Lambda})}(P_{A,\Lambda}A), k) = \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \to (E_\Lambda) \xrightarrow{\iota_A} (P_{A,\Lambda}).$$

On the other hand, suppose $P_{A,\Lambda}A$ admits the continuous functional calculus

$$\iota_{P_{A,\Lambda}A} \colon \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma_{(P_{A,\Lambda})}(P_{A,\Lambda}A), k) \to (P_{A,\Lambda})$$

for each $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})$. The inclusions $(P_{A,\Lambda}) \hookrightarrow \mathscr{A}$ induce a bounded k-linear homomorphism

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \phi \colon & \displaystyle\prod_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} (P_{A,\Lambda}) & \to & \mathscr{A} \\ & F = (F_\Lambda)_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} & \mapsto & \phi(F) \coloneqq \displaystyle\sum_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} F_\Lambda. \end{array}$$

It is obvious that ϕ sends $(P_{A,\Lambda}A)_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}$ to A because $(P_{A,\Lambda})_{\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}$ is a partition of unity. Note that for two distinct reductive spectra $\Lambda, \Lambda' \in \sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})$, one has $BB' = 0$ for any $(B, B') \in (P_{A,\Lambda}) \times (P_{A,\Lambda'})$. Indeed, it is trivial when $B = 0$ or $B' = 0$. If $B \neq 0$ and $B' \neq 0$, then for any $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, take elements $(P_{A,\Lambda}DP_{A,\Lambda}, P_{A,\Lambda'}D'P_{A,\Lambda'}) \in P_{A,\Lambda}\mathscr{A}P_{A,\Lambda} \times P_{A,\Lambda'}\mathscr{A}P_{A,\Lambda'}$ such that $\|B - P_{A,\Lambda}DP_{A,\Lambda}\| < \min\{\epsilon\|B'\|^{-1}, \|B\|\}$ and $\|B' - P_{A,\Lambda'}D'P_{A,\Lambda'}\| < \min\{\epsilon\|B\|^{-1}, \|B'\|\}$. Then one obtains

$$\begin{array}{cl} & \|BB'\| \\ = & \|(B - P_{A,\Lambda}DP_{A,\Lambda})(B' - P_{A,\Lambda'}D'P_{A,\Lambda'}) + (B - P_{A,\Lambda}DP_{A,\Lambda})P_{A',\Lambda}D'P_{A,\Lambda'} \\ & +P_{A,\Lambda}DP_{A,\Lambda}(B' - P_{A,\Lambda'}D'P_{A,\Lambda'} + P_{A,\Lambda}DP_{A,\Lambda}P_{A,\Lambda'}D'P_{A,\Lambda'})\| \\ \leq & \max\{\epsilon^2, \epsilon, \epsilon, 0\} = \epsilon \end{array}$$

and hence $\|BB'\| = 0$. Therefore for elements $F, F' \in \prod_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}(P_{A,\Lambda})$, one has

$$\phi(FF') = \phi((F_\Lambda F'_\Lambda)_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}) = \sum_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} F_\Lambda F'_\Lambda = \sum_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} \sum_{\Lambda'\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} F_\Lambda F'_{\Lambda'}$$

$$= \left(\sum_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} F_\Lambda\right)\left(\sum_{\Lambda'\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} F'_{\Lambda'}\right) = \phi(F)\phi(F'),$$

and hence ϕ is multiplicative. Moreover the sum $\sum_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} P_{A,\Lambda}$ is the identity $1 \in \mathscr{A}$ and it means that ϕ is a k-algebra homomorphism. Furthermore it is injective because it has the right inverse map

$$\begin{aligned}\psi\colon \mathscr{A} &\to \prod_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} (P_{A,\Lambda}) \\ B &\mapsto (P_{A,\Lambda} B P_{A,\Lambda})_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}.\end{aligned}$$

Be careful that ψ is neither the left inverse map of ϕ nor a k-algebra homomorphism in general. Now for an element $F \in \prod_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})}(P_{A,\Lambda})$, one has

$$\|\phi(F)\| = \left\|\sum_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} F_\Lambda\right\| \leq \max_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} \|F_\Lambda\| = \|F\|$$

and

$$\|F\| = \|\psi(\phi(F))\| = \max_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} \|P_{A,\Lambda}\phi(F)P_{A,\Lambda}\| \leq \max_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} \|P_{A,\Lambda}\|\|\phi(F)\|\|P_{A,\Lambda}\| = \|\phi(F)\|,$$

and it follows that ϕ is an isometry.

Thus the composition

$$\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \cong_k \prod_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\Lambda \cap \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) = \prod_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma_{(P_{A,\Lambda})}(P_{A,\Lambda}A), k)$$

$$\xrightarrow{\prod \iota_{P_{A,\Lambda}A}} \prod_{\Lambda\in\sigma_{\widetilde{A}}(\overline{A})} (P_{A,\Lambda}) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathscr{A}$$

is an isometric k-algebra homomorphism sending the coordinate function $z\colon \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \to k$ to $A \in \mathscr{A}$, and is the continuous functional calculus of A in $\mathscr{A}$. □

We verify properties of this partition of unity so that we formulate a criterion for the continuous functional calculus analogous to the algorithm in Theorem 6.7. Note that we assumed $\|A\| = 1$ in Proposition 6.8, but the replacement of A by $P_{A,\Lambda}A$ does not preserves such a norm condition. Therefore when we consider the criterion, we have to assign some suitable condition of the norm map of $\mathscr{A}$.

Lemma 6.14. *In the situation in Proposition 6.8, for an element $a \in k^\circ$, one has $\|A-a\| < 1$ if and only if $\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) = \{\overline{a}\}$. Moreover then one has $A \in \mathscr{A}(1)^{-1}$.*

Proof. Suppose $\|A - a\| < 1$. Then obviously $\overline{A} - \overline{a} = \overline{A - a} = 0 \in \widetilde{\mathscr{A}}$. and therefore $\overline{a} \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$. For an element $b \in k^\circ$ with $\overline{b} \neq \overline{a}$, one has

$$A - b = (a - b) + (A - a) = (a - b)(1 + (a - b)^{-1}(A - a)) \in k(1)^\times(1 + \mathscr{A}(1-)) \subset \mathscr{A}(1)^\times$$

by Proposition 2.17, and hence $\overline{b} \notin \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$ by Proposition 3.4. It follows $\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) = \{\overline{a}\}$. The inequality $\|A - a\| < 1 = \|A\|$ implies $|a| = 1$, and hence $0 \notin \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$. Therefore $A \in \mathscr{A}(1)^\times$ by Proposition 3.4.

On the other hand, suppose $\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) = \{\overline{a}\}$. Since A admits the reductive functional calculus, one has $\overline{A} = \overline{a}$. Therefore $\|A - a\| < 1$. □

Proposition 6.15. *Let $A \in \mathscr{A}$ be a reductively finite element admitting the reductive continuous functional calculus. For an element $a \in k^\times$ with $\|A\| = |a|$, the canonical homeomorphism $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \to \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(a^{-1}A) \subset k^\circ$ and the canonical projection $k^\circ \twoheadrightarrow \widetilde{k}$ induces a surjective map $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \to \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{a^{-1}A})$. In particular $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \neq \emptyset$.*

This is obviously an analogue of Proposition 6.5. Unlike the matrix case, one has to assume the unitarity of the normal reduction, but such an assumption is not so crucial because we will assume it in the criterion of the unitarity in Theorem 6.22.

Proof. Replacing A by $a^{-1}A$, we may and do assume $\|A\| = 1$ without loss of generality, and then $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset k^\circ$. For a spectrum $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$, one has $A - \lambda \notin \mathscr{A}^\times$ by definition and hence $A - \lambda \notin \mathscr{A}(1)^\times$. It follows $\overline{\lambda} \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$ by Proposition 3.4, and therefore the projection $k^\circ \twoheadrightarrow \widetilde{k}$ induces the reduction map $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \to \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$. Take a section $[\cdot] \colon \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) \to k^\circ \colon \Lambda \to [\Lambda]$ of the restriction of the canonical projection $k^\circ \to \widetilde{k}$ on the finite subset $\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) \subset \widetilde{k}$. Assume the reduction map is not surjective, and take a reductive spectrum $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$ which is not contained in the image of $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. Denote by $\lambda \in k^\circ$ the representative $[\Lambda] \in \Lambda$. The previous lemma guarantees that $\|A - \lambda\| = 1$, and therefore since A admits the reductive continuous functional calculus, $\overline{A} - \Lambda = \overline{A - \lambda} \neq 0$ admits the continuous functional calculus. Therefore one obtains the partition $(P_{A-\lambda,\Lambda'})_{\Lambda' \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}-\Lambda)}$ of unity by Proposition 6.8. Remark that $\sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}-\Lambda) = \{\Lambda' - \Lambda \mid \Lambda' \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})\}$, and hence $0 \notin \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A} - \Lambda)$ because of the way of the choice of Λ. Set $U^{(s)} := \sum_{\Lambda' \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}-\Lambda)} [\Lambda']^s P_{A-\Lambda,\Lambda'} \in \mathscr{A}(1)$ for each $s \in \{1, -1\} \subset \mathbb{Z}$. Then one has

$$U^{(1)}U^{(-1)} = U^{(-1)}U^{(1)} = \sum_{\Lambda',\Lambda'' \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}-\Lambda)} [\Lambda'][\Lambda'']^{-1} P_{A-\Lambda,\Lambda'} P_{A-\Lambda,\Lambda''} = \sum_{\Lambda' \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}-\Lambda)} P_{A-\Lambda,\Lambda'} = 1 \in \mathscr{A},$$

and hence $U^{(1)} \in \mathscr{A}(1)^\times$. By the construction of the partition $(P_{A-\lambda,\Lambda'})_{\Lambda' \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}-\Lambda)}$ of unity, one obtains $\overline{U^{(1)}} = \sum_{\Lambda' \in \sigma_{\widetilde{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}-\Lambda)} \Lambda \iota_{\overline{A}-\Lambda}(1_{\Lambda'}) = \overline{A} - \Lambda$, and therefore $\|U^{(1)} - (A - \lambda)\| < 1$. It follows that

$$A - \lambda = U^{(1)} - \left(U^{(1)} - (A - \lambda)\right) = U^{(1)} \left(1 - U^{(-1)}(U^{(1)} - (A - \lambda))\right)$$

$$\in \mathscr{A}(1)^{\times}(1 + \mathscr{A}(1-)) = \mathscr{A}(1)^{\times},$$

and hence $\Lambda = \overline{\lambda} \notin \sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$ by Proposition 3.4. It contradicts the condition $\Lambda \in \sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$, and thus the reduction map $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \to \sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$ is surjective. □

Corollary 6.16. *If a reductively finite element $A \in \mathscr{A}$ admits the reductive continuous functional calculus, then one has*

$$\|A\| = \sup_{\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)} |\lambda|.$$

See also Proposition 4.24.

Proof. It suffices to verify the equality in the case $\|A\| = 1$, and then one has $1 = \|A\| \geq \sup_{\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)} |\lambda|$. Assume $\sup_{\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)} |\lambda| < 1$. By Proposition 6.15, one obtains $\sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A}) = \{0\}$, and since $\overline{A}$ admits the continuous functional calculus, one acquires $\overline{A} = 0$. It contradicts the fact $\|A\| = 1$, and hence $\sup_{\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)} |\lambda| = 1$. □

Definition 6.17. *Suppose k is a local field, Definition 2.31, and $\|\mathscr{A}\| = |k|$. Take a uniformiser $\pi \in k$. For a non-zero element $A \in \mathscr{A} \backslash \{0\}$, denote by $v(A)$ the logarithm $-\log_{|\pi|} \|A\| \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $v(A)$ is independent of the choice of $\pi \in k$.*

Definition 6.18. *Suppose k is a local field and $\|\mathscr{A}\| = |k|$. Take a uniformiser π. Set $\mathscr{N}_{-1}(\mathscr{A}) := \mathscr{A}$, and define the maps P_0 and r_0 in the following way:*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} P_0 \colon \mathscr{N}_{-1}(\mathscr{A}) & \to & \mathscr{A} \\ A & \mapsto & 1 \\ r_0 \colon \mathscr{N}_{-1}(\mathscr{A}) & \to & \mathscr{A} \\ A & \mapsto & P_0(A)A = A. \end{array}$$

An element $A \in \mathscr{A}$ is said to be naive of level 0 at 0 if one of the following holds:

(i) $A = 0$ *; or*

(ii) A is a non-invertible reductively finite element admitting the reductive continuous functional calculus.

Denote by $\mathscr{N}_0(\mathscr{A}) \subset \mathscr{A}$ the subset of naive elements of level 0 at 0, and define the maps $P(\cdot, \mathscr{A}) = P_1$ and r_1 in the following way:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} P(\cdot, \mathscr{A}) = P_1 \colon \mathscr{N}_{-1}(\mathscr{A}) & \to & \mathscr{A} \\ A & \mapsto & P(A, \mathscr{A}) = P_1(A) := \begin{cases} 0 & (\textit{If (i) holds.}) \\ P_{\pi^{v(A)}A,0} & (\textit{If (ii) holds.}) \end{cases} \\ r_1 \colon \mathscr{N}_{-1}(\mathscr{A}) & \to & \mathscr{A} \\ A & \mapsto & P_1(A)A = P(A, \mathscr{A})A. \end{array}$$

Inductively for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, set $\mathscr{N}_{i+1}(\mathscr{A}) \coloneqq r_1^{-1}(\mathscr{N}_i(\mathscr{A})) \subset \mathscr{N}_i(\mathscr{A})$, and define the maps P_{i+2} and r_{i+2} in the following way:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} P_{i+2} \colon \mathscr{N}_{i+1}(\mathscr{A}) & \to & (P_{i+1}(A)) \subset \mathscr{A} \\ A & \mapsto & P(P_{i+1}(A)A, (P_{i+1}(A)))P_{i+1}(A) \\ r_{i+2} \colon \mathscr{N}_{i+1}(\mathscr{A}) & \to & \mathscr{A} \\ A & \mapsto & r_{i+1}(r_1(A)) \end{array}$$

Then one has $r_{i+1}(A) = P_{i+1}(A)A$ and $P_{i+2}(A)P_{i+1}(A) = P_{i+1}(A)P_{i+2}(A) = P_{i+2}(A)$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A \in \mathscr{N}_i(\mathscr{A})$. An element $A \in \mathscr{A}$ is said to be naive of level i at a point $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ if $A - \lambda \in \mathscr{N}_i(\mathscr{A})$ for an integer $i \in \mathbb{N}$. An element $A \in \mathscr{A}$ is said to be naive at a point $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ if A is naive of level i at a point $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ for any integer $i \in \mathbb{N}$. An element $A \in \mathscr{A}$ is said to be naive if A is naive at any point $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. The notions above are independent of the choice of $\pi \in k$.

Lemma 6.19. *Suppose k is a local field. For a non-empty compact subset $\sigma \subset k$, one has $\|C(\sigma, k)\| = |k|$ and the coordinate function $z \colon \sigma \hookrightarrow k$ in the Banach k-algebra $C(\sigma, k)$ is naive.*

Proof. The first implication is trivial by the maximal modulus principle of a continuous function on a compact topological space. For an integer $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and a spectrum $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathrm{C}(\sigma,k)}(z) = \sigma$, we verify that z is naive of level i at a point $\lambda \in \sigma$. One has

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{C}(\sigma,k)}(z - \lambda) = \sigma - \lambda \coloneqq \{ \lambda' - \lambda \mid \lambda' \in \sigma \},$$

and the parallel transform $\sigma \to \sigma - \lambda \coloneqq z \mapsto z - \lambda$ induces the isometric isomorphism $\mathrm{C}(\sigma, k) \to \mathrm{C}(\sigma - \lambda, k)$ sending $z - \lambda$ to the coordinate function $z' \colon \sigma - \lambda \hookrightarrow k$. Therefore replacing σ by $\sigma - \lambda$, we may and do assume $\lambda = 0 \in \sigma$. If $z = 0$, i.e. $\sigma = \{0\}$, then z is naive at 0 by definition. Otherwise, replacing σ by $a^{-1}\sigma$ for an element $a \in k^{\times}$ with $\|z\| = |a|$, assume $\|z\| = 1$. Denote by $\overline{\sigma} \subset \tilde{k}$ the image of σ by the canonical projection $k^{\circ} \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{k}$, and note that $\sigma_{\mathrm{C}(\sigma,k)^{\sim}}(\overline{z}) = \overline{\sigma}$ by the proof of Proposition 4.38.

It is obvious that z is naive of level 0 at 0 by Proposition 4.38, and the partition $(P_{z,\Lambda})_{\Lambda \in \overline{\sigma}}$ of unity is the system of the characteristic functions of the cosets of σ given by the projection $\sigma \twoheadrightarrow \overline{\sigma}$. The multiplicative k-Banach subspace $(P_{z,0}) \subset \mathrm{C}(\sigma, k)$ is identified with the Banach k-algebra $\mathrm{C}(\sigma \cap k^{\circ\circ}, k)$ by the restriction, and the function $r_1(z) = P_{z,0}z \in \mathrm{C}(\sigma, k)$ corresponds to the coordinate function of the non-empty compact subset $\sigma \cap k^{\circ\circ} \subset k$ through this identification. Therefore the induction on the level i works, and hence z is naive at 0. □

Lemma 6.20. *Suppose k is a local field and $\|\mathscr{A}\| = |k|$. Then one has $\|r_{i+1}(A)\| \leq |\pi|^{i+1}\|A\|$ for an element $A \in \mathscr{N}_i(\mathscr{A})$, an integer $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and a uniformiser $\pi \in k$.*

Proof. It suffices to verify the inequality in the case $\|A\| = 1$ and $i = 0$, and then the estimation is trivial by Corollary 6.16. □

Remark 6.21. *In the situation above, for a naive element $A \in \mathscr{A}$ of level $i \in \mathbb{N}$ at 0, the norm $\|r_{i+1}(A)\| = \|P_{i+1}(A)A\| \leq |\pi|^{i+1}\|A\|$ coincides with 0 or the radius of the $(i+1)$-st largest closed disc in $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ centred at 0. In particular since the valuation of a local field is discrete by definition, the norms forms a strictly decreasing sequence converging to 0.*

Theorem 6.22. *Suppose k is a local field and $\|\mathscr{A}\| = |k|$. Then an element $A \in \mathscr{A}$ admits the functional calculus $i_A \colon C(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \to \mathscr{A}$ if and only if A is naive.*

Proof. If A admits the functional calculus, then A is naive by the previous example. Suppose A is naive. Take a locally constant function $c \in \mathrm{C}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)$. Since $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ is compact, there is a positive number $r > 0$ such that c is constant on each disc of radius r in $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. Here we mean by a disc of radius r (or $r-$) a subset of $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ of the form $\{b \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \mid |b-a| \leq r\}$ (resp. $\{b \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \mid |b-a| < r\}$) for some $a \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. Replacing r by a smaller number, we may and do assume $r \in |k^\times|$. For each spectrum $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$, since A is naive at λ, there is an integer $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|r_i(A-\lambda)\| \leq r$, and denote by $i_\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ the least integer among such integers. Closed discs centred at some $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ of radius $\|r_{i_\lambda}(A-\lambda)\|$ covers $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$, and $\|r_{i_\lambda}(A-\lambda)\| = 0$ only when λ is isolated in $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ by the construction of r_{i_λ}. Therefore the closed discs has a finite disjoint subcovering because a closed disc of positive radius is open in an ultrametric space. Let $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ be the centres of the closed discs in the subcovering. Define the substitution $c(A)$ as the sum $\sum_{j=1}^n c(\lambda_j)P_{i_{\lambda_j}}(A-\lambda_j) \in \mathscr{A}$. By Proposition 6.11, one has

$$\|c(A)\| = \max{}_{j=1}^{n}|c(\lambda)| = \|c\|.$$

Now the image $c(A)$ is independent of the choice of $r > 0$ and the covering of $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$ by closed discs of radii no greater than r. Indeed, the sum of the partition of unity is 1, and hence the image $c(A)$ is stable under the refinement of the covering.

Given two locally constant functions $c, c' \colon \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \to k$, take coverings for the definition of $c(A)$ and $c'(A)$. Refining them, suppose they are a common covering. Then the equalities $(c+c)(A) = c(A) + c'(A)$ and $(cc)(A) = c(A)c'(A)$ are obvious. Moreover, for a constant map $c \in k \subset \mathrm{C}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)$, the image of $c(A)$ coincides with $c \in k$ by definition: the covering is taken by the singleton of the total space $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. Thus the substitution map $c \mapsto c(A)$ is a k-algebra homomorphism from the k-subalgebra of $\mathrm{c}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \subset \mathrm{C}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)$ of locally constant functions to $\mathscr{A}$, and is an isometry with respect to the restriction of the supremum norm of $\mathrm{C}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)$.

Since $\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \subset k$ is a totally disconnected compact Hausdorff topological space, the k-subalgebra $\mathrm{c}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \subset \mathrm{C}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k)$ is dense, and therefore it can be uniquely extended to be the isometry $\iota_A \colon \mathrm{C}(\sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A), k) \to \mathscr{A}$. It is obvious that it sends a sequence of locally constant functions converging to the coordinate function $z \colon \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A) \hookrightarrow k$ to a sequence converging to $A \in \mathscr{A}$ because the approximation of A by the linear combination of the projections works in modulo $\mathscr{A}(\|A\|-) = \pi^{v(A)+1}\mathscr{A}(1)$, where $\pi \in k$ is a uniformiser. We conclude that ι_A is the continuous functional calculus. $\square$

The criterion for the normality in Theorem 6.22 possesses the process of the inductive calculus with infinite steps, and hence the practical use of the criterion needs some conditions of an operator which give it kind of the structure of a fractal. See the following example:

Example 6.23. *Suppose k is a local field over* $\mathbb{Q}_p$. *Set* $\mathscr{A} := \mathscr{B}_k(C_0(\mathbb{Z}, k))$, *and consider the element* $A \in \mathscr{A}$ *whose matrix presentation with respect to the canonical orthonormal Schauder basis of* $C_0(\mathbb{Z}, k)$ *is*

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \iddots \\ \cdots & -2 & p & p^2 & p^3 & p^4 & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & -1 & p & p^2 & p^3 & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & p & p^2 & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & p & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & \cdots \\ \iddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

where the centre of the matrix presentation above is the $(0, 0)$*-entry. It is obvious that* $\|A\| \leq 1$ *and* $\mathbb{Z} \subset \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. *Therefore one has* $\|A\| = 1$ *and* $\mathbb{Z}_p = \sigma_{\mathscr{A}}(A)$. *Its normal reduction coincides with the matrix reduction by Proposition 3.9, and the reduction trivially admits the continuous functional calculus because the matrix presentation of the reduction is a diagonal matrix. The reductive spectrum* $\sigma_{\overline{\mathscr{A}}}(\overline{A})$ *coincides with* $\mathbb{F}_p \subset \widetilde{k}$. *For the partition* $(P_{A,\Lambda})_{\Lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p}$, *it is easy to see that the triads* $(A, \mathscr{A}, C_0(\mathbb{Z}, k))$ *and* $(P_{A,\bar{i}}A, (P_{A,\bar{i}}), C_0(i + p\mathbb{Z}, k))$ *of the p-adic Banach representations admits similar matrix presentations for each* $i = 0, \ldots, p-1$, *and hence the induction process in Theorem 6.22 works. Indeed it admits the continuous functional calculus* $\iota_A \colon C(\mathbb{Z}_p, k) \to \mathscr{A}$, *and for a continuous map* $F \colon \mathbb{Z}_p \to k$, *the matrix presentation of the substitution* $\iota_A(F) = F(A)$ *is*

$$F(M) =$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \iddots \\ \cdots & F(-2) & (F(-1)-F(-2))p & (F(0)-F(-1))p^2 & (F(1)-F(0))p^3 & (F(2)-F(1))p^4 & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & F(-1) & (F(0)-F(-1))p & (F(1)-F(0))p^2 & (F(2)-F(1))p^3 & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & 0 & F(0) & (F(1)-F(0))p & (F(2)-F(1))p^2 & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & F(1) & (F(2)-F(1))p & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & F(2) & \cdots \\ \iddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

which is analogous to the holomorphic functional calculus of the Toepliz operator, Example 5.7. It is remarkable that the difference $F(n+1) - F(n)$ *appears in the entry of the matrix presentation of the continuous functional calculus, while the differential coefficient* $F_n = (n!)^{-1}(d^nF/dT^n)(0)$ *does in the matrix presentation of the holomorphic functional calculus of the Toepliz operator. The differential operator* $F(z) \mapsto F'(z)$ *is continuous in the class of rigid analytic functions* $F \in k\{z\}$, *and the difference operator* $F(z) \mapsto F(z+1) - F(z)$ *is continuous in the class of naive, i.e. continuous, functions* $F \in C(\mathbb{Z}_p, k)$.

7 Unbounded Normal Operator

Finally we formulate the continuous functional calculus for an unbounded operator and give the explicit definition of a non-Archimedean physical quantity. Many of important Archimedean physical quantities, such as the momentum $P = d/dx$ and the Hamiltonian $E = H$, are unbounded, and hence we have to consider unbounded operators. Note that an Archimedean physical quantity is presented by a closed self-adjoint operator, and hence it admits the continuous functional calculus using the spectral measure even if it is unbounded. Therefore the analogous notion, a non-Archimedean physical quantity, should also be presented by an operator admitting the continuous functional calculus in some sense. To begin with, we introduce the notion of the spectrum of an unbounded operator. In this section, let V be a k-Banach space, $W \subset V$ a k-vector subspace, and $\sigma \subset k$ a non-empty closed subset.

Definition 7.1. *For an operator $A \colon W \to V$, denote by $\rho(A) \subset k$ the subset of points $t \in k$ such that the operator $A - t \colon W \to V$ is injective and its inverse map $(A - t)^{-1} \colon V \to W \hookrightarrow V$ is bounded. Call it the k-rational resolvent of A. Set $\sigma(A) := k \backslash \rho(A)$, and call it the k-rational spectrum of A. If there is no ambiguity on k, just call it the spectrum of A for short.*

Proposition 7.2. *For an operator $A \colon W \to V$, the spectrum $\sigma(A) \subset k$ is closed. If A is an everywhere defined bounded operator, i.e. $A \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$, then $\sigma(A) = \sigma_{\mathscr{B}_k(V)}(A)$ and it is a bounded closed subset.*

Proof. The first assertion follows from the equality

$$(A - t)^{-1} = (A - t_0)^{-1}(1 - (t - t_0)(A - t_0)^{-1}) = (A - t_0)^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (t - t_0)^n (A - t_0)^{-n} \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$$

for any $t_0 \in \rho(A)$ and $s \in k$ with $|t - t_0| < \|A - t_0\|$. The second assertion is trivial by definition. □

Definition 7.3. *For a totally disconnected metric space X, a continuous function $f \colon X \to k$ is said to be tempered if the restriction $f|_S \colon S \to k$ is bounded for any bounded clopen subset $S \subset X$. The subset $C_{tem}(X, k) \subset C(X, k)$ of tempered continuous functions coincides with the intersection of the pre-image of $C_{bd}(S, k) \subset C(S, k)$ by the restriction map $C(X, k) \to C(S, k)$ for all bounded clopen subsets $S \subset X$, and hence is a k-subalgebra. Endow $C_{tem}(X, k)$ with the topology of uniform convergences on each bounded clopen subset, i.e. a net $(f_i)_{i \in I}$ in $C_{tem}(X, k)$ indexed by a directed set I converges to $f \in C_{tem}(X, k)$ if and only if for each bounded clopen subset $S \subset X$, the restriction $(f_i|_S)_{i \in I}$ converges to $f|_S$ in $C_{bd}(S, k)$.*

Example 7.4. *If a totally disconnected metric space X is bounded, then one has $C_{bd}(X, k) = C_{tem}(X, k)$.*

Lemma 7.5. *The k-subalgebra $k[z] \subset C(\sigma, k)$ generated by the coordinate function $z \colon \sigma \hookrightarrow k$ is contained in $C_{tem}(\sigma, k)$. Furthermore, for a continuous function $f \in k[z]$ invertible in $C(\sigma, k)$, its inverse $f^{-1} \in C(\sigma, k)$ is bounded, and in particular tempered.*

Proof. The first assertion directly follows from Lemma 4.15. Take an algebraic closure K of k. Since k is complete subspace of the metric space K, k is closed in K. For a continuous function $f \in k[z]$ invertible in $C(\sigma, k)$, take a polynomial $F \in k[T]$ with $F(z) = f$, and let $Z \subset K$ be the set of zeros of F in K. If $F \in k$, then f is a constant function and hence its inverse f^{-1} is bounded. Therefore consider the case $F \notin k$. Since f is invertible, F is a non-zero non-scalar polynomial, and it follows that Z is a non-empty finite set. In particular, $Z \subset K$ is a non-empty compact subspace of the metric space K, and the distance $d \in [0, \infty)$ between Z and the closed subset $\sigma \subset k \subset K$ is positive definite. Therefore for a spectrum $\lambda \in \sigma$, one has $|f^{-1}(\lambda)| = |F(z)^{-1}(\lambda)| \leq d^{-\deg F}$, and hence f^{-1} is bounded. □

Definition 7.6. *Endow $C_{tem}(\sigma, k)$ with the topology of uniform convergences on each bounded clopen subset, i.e. a net $(f_i)_{i \in I}$ in $C_{tem}(\sigma, k)$ indexed by a directed set I converges to $f \in C_{tem}(\sigma, k)$ if and only if for each bounded clopen subset $S \subset \sigma$, the restriction $(f_i|_S)_{i \in I}$ converges to $f|_S$ in $C_{bd}(S, k)$.*

Lemma 7.7. *The inclusion $C_{bd}(\sigma, k) \hookrightarrow C_{tem}(\sigma, k)$ is continuous.*

Proof. The continuity of the inclusion is obvious because the restriction maps are contractions. □

Remark that the topology of uniform convergences and the topology of uniform convergences on bounded clopen subsets differ when σ is not bounded. Therefore the inclusion above is not a homeomorphism onto the image.

Definition 7.8. *For a bounded clopen subset $S \subset \sigma$, define a multiplicative k-linear map $1_S^* \colon C_{bd}(S, k) \to C_{bd}(\sigma, k)$ as a map sending a bounded continuous function $f \colon S \to k$ to the extension of f by 0 outside S, which is continuous because $S \subset \sigma$ is clopen. Then obviously 1_S^* is the right inverse map of the restriction map $C_{bd}(\sigma, k) \to C_{bd}(S, k)$.*

Lemma 7.9. *For a bounded clopen subset $S \subset \sigma$, the extension map $1_S^* \colon C_{bd}(S, k) \to C_{bd}(\sigma, k)$ is the right inverse map of the restriction map $C_{bd}(\sigma, k) \to C_{bd}(S, k)$ and is continuous.*

Proof. The first assertion is obvious. Since 1_S^* is a contraction, it is continuous. □

Definition 7.10. *Denote by $C_{rig}(\sigma, k) \subset C_{tem}(\sigma, k)$ the closure of the localization of $k[z] \subset C_{tem}(\sigma, k)$ by functions in $k[z] \cap C_{tem}(\sigma, k)^\times$.*

Definition 7.11. *A non-empty closed subset $\sigma \subset k$ is said to be analysable if it admits an increasing sequence $S_0 \subset S_1 \subset \cdots \subset \sigma$ of bounded clopen subsets such that $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S_n = \sigma$ and the characteristic function $1_{S_n} \colon \sigma \to k$ of S_n is contained in $C_{rig}(\sigma, k)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Call such an increasing sequence $S_0 \subset S_1 \subset \cdots \subset \sigma$ an analysable filtration of σ.*

Be careful that a refinement of an analysable filtration is not necessarily an analysable filtration, because the class of rigid continuous functions does not possess enough idempotents while that of bounded continuous functions does.

Example 7.12. *If $\sigma \subset k$ is bounded, then σ is analysable and the convention $C_{rig}(\sigma, k)$ coincides with the previous one, Definition 4.16.*

Lemma 7.13. *For a bounded clopen subset $S \subset \sigma$, if its characteristic function $1_S \colon \sigma \to k$ is contained in $C_{rig}(\sigma, k)$, then the image of $C_{rig}(S, k)$ by the extension map $1_S^* \colon C_{rig}(S, k) \to C_{bd}(\sigma, k)$ is contained in $C_{rig}(\sigma, k)$.*

Proof. Trivial by the definition of the topology of $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{tem}}(\sigma, k)$. □

Definition 7.14. *An operator $A \colon W \to V$ is said to be closed if $W \subset V$ is dense and if its graph $\Gamma_A := \{(w, Aw) \mid w \in W\} \subset W \times V$ is closed. Denote by $Cl_k(V)$ the set of closed operators on V.*

The class of closed operators is one of practical generalisations of the class of everywhere defined bounded operators.

Example 7.15. *An everywhere defined bounded operator is closed. Therefore one has $\mathscr{B}_k(V) \subset Cl_k(V)$.*

Proposition 7.16. *Suppose the valuation of k is non-trivial. An everywhere defined operator $A \colon V \to V$ is bounded if and only if it is closed.*

Proof. This is what is called the closed graph theorem. See [BGR], 2.8.1. □

Now we define the continuous functional calculus for a closed operator. Be careful that the following formulation is not suitable one for the definition of the normality of an operator because it lacks the uniqueness of the continuous functional calculus. We will assign to a normal operator the additional condition of the uniqueness of the continuous functional calculus.

Definition 7.17. *An operator $A \colon W \to V$ is said to admits an extended continuous functional calculus if its spectrum $\sigma(A) \subset k$ is analysable and there are a map*

$$\iota_A \colon C_{rig}(\sigma(A), k) \to Cl_k(V)$$

and an analysable filtration $S_0 \subset S_1 \subset \cdots \subset \sigma(A)$ of $\sigma(A)$ satisfying the following:

(i) The map ι_A preserves the addition, the multiplication, and the identity;

(ii) For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the idempotent $\iota_A(1_{S_n})$ is an everywhere defined bounded projection, $\|\iota_A(1_{S_n})\| = 1$, and its image $\iota_A(1_{S_n})(V) = \ker(1 - \iota_A(1_{S_n})) \subset V$ is contained in W;

(iii) *The the image of* $C_{rig}(\sigma(A), k) \cap C_{bd}(\sigma(A), k)$ *by* ι_A *is contained in* $\mathscr{B}_k(V)$*, and the restriction*

$$\iota_A \colon C_{rig}(\sigma(A), k) \cap C_{bd}(\sigma(A), k) \to \mathscr{B}_k(V)$$

is an isometric homomorphism of Banach k-algebras;

(iv) *For a rigid continuous function* $f \in C_{rig}(\sigma(A), k)$*, the sequence* $(\iota_A(1_{S_n} f))_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)^{\mathbb{N}}$ *of projections converges to* $\iota_A(f) \in Cl_k(V)$ *with respect to the topology of pointwise convergences, i.e, for any* $v \in V$ *in the domain of* f*, one has* $\lim_{n \to \infty} \iota_A(1_{S_n} f)v = fv$*; and*

(v) *The composition*

$$\iota_A \circ 1_{S_n}^* \colon C_{rig}(S_n, k) \to C_{rig}(\sigma(A), k) \cap C_{bd}(\sigma(A), k) \to \mathscr{B}_k(V)$$

induces an isometry

$$\iota_{\iota_A(1_{S_n})A|_{\ker(1 - \iota_A(1_{S_n}))}} \colon C_{rig}(S_n, k) \to \mathscr{B}_k(\ker(1 - \iota_A(1_{S_n})))$$

sending the coordinate function $1_{S_n} z \colon S_n \hookrightarrow k$ *to* $\iota_A(1_{S_n})A|_{\ker(1 - \iota_A(1_{S_n}))}$*, where the operator algebra* $\mathscr{B}_k(\ker(1 - \iota_A(1_{S_n})))$ *is identified with* $(\iota_A(1_{S_n})) \subset \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ *by the isometry given by the inclusion and the restriction of operators on the A-stable closed subspace* $\ker(1 - \iota_A(1_{S_n})) \subset V$.

Call ι_A *an extended functional calculus of* A *associated with* $S_0 \subset S_1 \subset \cdots \subset \sigma(A)$.

Example 7.18. *An everywhere defined bounded operator* $A \colon V \to V$ *admits an extended continuous functional calculus associated with the canonical analysable filtration* $S_0 = S_1 = \cdots = \sigma_{\mathscr{B}_k(V)}(A)$ *of* $\sigma(A) = \sigma_{\mathscr{B}_k(V)}(A)$ *if ands only if it admits the continuous functional calculus.*

Lemma 7.19. *In the situation in Definition 7.17, the union* $\widetilde{W} \subset W$ *of the images of the projections* $\iota_A(1_{S_n})$ *is dense in* V.

Proof. For any $v \in V$, one has

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \iota_A(1_{S_n})v = \iota_A(1)v = v$$

by the conditions (i) and (iv). Therefore $\widetilde{W} \subset V$ is dense. □

Lemma 7.20. *In the situation in Definition 7.17, for any rigid continuous function* $f \in C_{rig}(\sigma(A), k)$*, the domain of the closed operator* $\iota_A(f)$ *contains* $\widetilde{W}$.

Proof. For any $w \in \widetilde{W}$, take an integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\iota_A(1_{S_N})w = w$. Then one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n,m\to\infty} \|\iota_A(1_{S_n} f)w - \iota_A(1_{S_m} f)w\| = \lim_{n,m\to\infty} \|\iota_A(1_{S_n} f)\iota_A(1_{S_N})w - \iota_A(1_{S_m} f)\iota_A(1_{S_N})w\| \\ = \ &\lim_{n,m\to\infty} \|\iota_A(1_{S_n} f 1_{S_N})w - \iota_A(1_{S_m} f 1_{S_N})w\| = \lim_{n,m\to\infty} \|\iota_A(1_{S_N} f)w - \iota_A(1_{S_N} f w\| = 0 \end{aligned}$$

by the conditions (i) and (iv), and hence the sequence $(\iota_A(1_{S_n} f)w)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to an element $v \in V$ by the completeness of V. Since $\iota_A(f)$ is densely defined and a metric space V is first countable, there is a sequence $(w_n)_{n\in N}$ in the domain of $\iota_A(f)$ converging to w. Then one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n\to\mathbb{N}}(w_n, \iota_A(f)w_n) = \lim_{m\to\mathbb{N}}(\iota_A(1_{S_m}), \iota_A(1_{S_m})) \lim_{n\to\mathbb{N}}(\iota_A(1_{S_m})w_n, \iota_A(1_{S_m})\iota_A(f)w_n) \\ = \ &\lim_{m\to\mathbb{N}} \lim_{n\to\mathbb{N}}(\iota_A(1_{S_m})w_n, \iota_A(1_{S_m})\iota_A(f)w_n) = \lim_{m\to\mathbb{N}} \lim_{n\to\mathbb{N}}(\iota_A(1_{S_m})w_n, \iota_A(1_{S_m} f)w_n) \\ = \ &\lim_{m\to\mathbb{N}} \lim_{n\to\mathbb{N}}(\iota_A(1_{S_m})w_n, \iota_A(1_{S_m} f 1_{S_m})w_n) = \lim_{m\to\mathbb{N}} \lim_{n\to\mathbb{N}}(\iota_A(1_{S_m})w_n, \iota_A(1_{S_m} f)\iota_A(1_{S_m})w_n) \\ = \ &\lim_{m\to\mathbb{N}}(\iota_A(1_{S_m})w, \iota_A(1_{S_m} f)\iota_A(1_{S_m})w) = \lim_{m\to\mathbb{N}}(\iota_A(1_{S_m})w, \iota_A(1_{S_m} f)w) = (w, v) \end{aligned}$$

by the conditions (i), (ii), and (iii), and hence w is contained in the domain of $\iota_A(f)$ by its closedness. □

Lemma 7.21. *Let $A \colon W \to V$ be a closed operator admitting an extended continuous functional calculus ι_A. For a polynomial $F \in k[T]$, one has $\iota_A(F(z)) = F(A)$, where $z \colon \sigma(A) \hookrightarrow k$ is the coordinate function.*

Proof. By the condition (i), it suffices to show that $\iota_A(z) = A$. Let $S_0 \subset S_1 \subset \cdots \subset \sigma(A)$ be the analysable filtration of $\sigma(A)$ with which ι_A is associated. For any $w \in \widetilde{W}$, the conditions (iv) and (v) and Lemma 7.20 guarantee that

$$\iota_A(z)w = \lim_{n\to\mathbb{N}} \iota_A(1_{S_n} z)w = \lim_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \iota_A(1_{S_n})Aw = \iota_A(1)Aw = Aw,$$

and hence $\iota_A(z) = A$ because $\widetilde{W} \subset V$ is dense. □

Since a refinement of an analysable filtration is not necessarily an analysable filtration, an extended continuous functional calculus is not unique in general even when an analysable filtration $S_0 \subset S_1 \subset \cdots \subset \sigma(A)$ is given and fixed. In other words, the projection $\iota_A(1_{S_n}) \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ is not determined by the bounded clopen subset $S_n \subset \sigma(A)$. On the other hand, the increasing system $(\iota_A(1_{S_n}))_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)^{\mathbb{N}}$ of projections possesses the information of the analysable filtration $S_0 \subset S_1 \subset \cdots \subset \sigma(A)$.

Proposition 7.22. *For an extended continuous functional calculus ι_A of A associated with an analysable filtration $S_0 \subset S_1 \subset \cdots \subset \sigma(A)$, one has $\sigma(PA|_{\ker(1-P)}) = S_n$ and $\sigma((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}) = \sigma(A) \backslash S_n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Take an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and set $P \coloneqq \iota_A(1_{S_n}) \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$. Since PA admits an isometry

$$\iota_{PA|_{\ker(1-P)}} \colon \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(S_n, k) \to \mathscr{B}_k(\ker(1-P)),$$

by the condition (v), one has $\sigma(PA|_{\ker(1-P)}) \subset S_n$. Take an element $\lambda \in S_n$. One has $((1-1_{S_n})z-(1-1_{S_n})\lambda)^{-1} \in \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma\backslash S_n, k)$ and $(1-1_{S_n})z-(1-1_{S_n})\lambda \in \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma\backslash S_n, k)^{\times}$ by Proposition 4.18. One obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
& \iota_{(1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}}\left((1-1_{S_n})z-(1-1_{S_n})\lambda)^{-1}\right)((1-P)A-(1-P)\lambda) \\
= \ & \iota_{(1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}}\left(((1-1_{S_n})z-(1-1_{S_n})\lambda)^{-1}\right)\iota_{(1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}}((1-1_{S_n})z-(1-1_{S_n})\lambda) \\
= \ & (\iota_A \circ 1^*_{S_n})\left(((1-1_{S_n})z-(1-1_{S_n})\lambda))^{-1}\right)(\iota_A \circ 1^*_{S_n})((1-1_{S_n})z-(1-1_{S_n})\lambda)\Big|_{\ker(P)} \\
= \ & \iota_A\left(((1-1_{S_n})(z-\lambda)+1_{S_n})^{-1}-1_{S_n}\right)\iota_A((1-1_{S_n})(z-\lambda))\Big|_{\ker(P)} \\
= \ & \lim_{n'\to\infty}\iota_A\left(1_{S_{n'}}\left(((1-1_{S_n})(z-\lambda)+1_{S_n})^{-1}-1_{S_n}\right)\right)\lim_{n''\to\infty}\iota_A(1_{S_{n''}}(1-1_{S_n})(z-\lambda))\Big|_{\ker(P)} \\
= \ & \lim_{n'\to\infty}\lim_{n''\to\infty}\iota_A\left(1_{S_{n'}}\left(((1-1_{S_n})(z-\lambda)+1_{S_n})^{-1}-1_{S_n}\right)\right)\iota_A(1_{S_{n''}}(1-1_{S_n})(z-\lambda))\Big|_{\ker(P)} \\
= \ & \lim_{n'\to\infty}\lim_{n''\to\infty}\iota_A\left(1_{S_{n'}}\left(((1-1_{S_n})(z-\lambda)+1_{S_n})^{-1}-1_{S_n}\right)1_{S_{n''}}(1-1_{S_n})(z-\lambda)\right)\Big|_{\ker(P)} \\
= \ & \lim_{n'\to\infty}\lim_{n''\to\infty}\iota_A(1_{S_{n'}}1_{S_{n''}}(((1-1_{S_n})(z-\lambda)+1_{S_n})^{-1}-1_{S_n})(((1-1_{S_n})(z-\lambda)+1_{S_n})-1_{S_n}))|_{\ker(P)} \\
= \ & \lim_{n'\to\infty}\iota_A(1_{S_{n'}}(((1-1_{S_n})(z-\lambda)+1_{S_n})^{-1}-1_{S_n})(((1-1_{S_n})(z-\lambda)+1_{S_n})-1_{S_n}))|_{\ker(P)} \\
= \ & \lim_{n'\to\infty}\iota_A(1_{S_{n'}}(1-S_n-S_n+S_n))|_{\ker(P)} = \iota_A(1-S_n)|_{\ker(P)} \\
= \ & (\iota_A(1)-\iota_A(S_n))|_{\ker(P)} = (1-P)|_{\ker(P)} = 1 \in \mathscr{B}_k(\ker(P))
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly $((1-P)A-(1-P)\lambda)\iota_A(((1-1_{S_n})z-(1-1_{S_n})\lambda)^{-1}) = 1 \in \mathscr{B}_k(\ker(P))$. It follows $\iota_A(((1-1_{S_n})z-(1-1_{S_n})\lambda)^{-1}) = ((1-P)A-(1-P)\lambda)^{-1}$, and since $((1-1_{S_n})z-(1-1_{S_n})\lambda)^{-1} \in \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bd}}(\sigma, k)$, one acquires $\iota_A(((1-1_{S_n})z-(1-1_{S_n})\lambda)^{-1}) \in \mathscr{B}_k(\ker(P))$. Therefore $\lambda \notin \sigma((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)})$. Assume $\lambda \notin \sigma(PA|_{\ker(1-P)})$. Then one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
& (A-\lambda)\left(P\left(PA|_{\ker(1-P)}-P\lambda\right)^{-1}P+(1-P)\left((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}(1-P)\lambda\right)^{-1}(1-P)\right) \\
= \ & ((AP-\lambda P)+(A(1-P)-\lambda(1-P))) \\
& \left(P\left(PA|_{\ker(1-P)}-P\lambda\right)^{-1}P+(1-P)\left((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}-(1-P)\lambda\right)^{-1}(1-P)\right) \\
= \ & (AP-\lambda P)\left(PA|_{\ker(1-P)}-P\lambda\right)^{-1}P+(A(1-P)-\lambda(1-P))\left((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}+(1-P)\lambda\right)^{-1}(1-P) \\
= \ & P\left(PA|_{\ker(1-P)}-P\lambda\right)\left(PA|_{\ker(1-P)}-P\lambda\right)^{-1}P \\
& +(1-P)\left((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}-(1-P)\lambda\right)\left((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}-(1-P)\lambda\right)^{-1}(1-P) \\
= \ & P1|_{\ker(P)}P+(1-P)1|_{\ker(P)}(1-P) = P^3+(1-P)^3 = P+(1-P) = 1 \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly $(P(PA|_{\ker(1-P)}-P\lambda)^{-1}P+(1-P)((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}-(1-P)\lambda)(1-P))(A-\lambda) = 1 \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$. It implies that $(A-\lambda)^{-1} = (P(PA|_{\ker(1-P)}-P\lambda)^{-1}P+(1-P)((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}-(1-P)\lambda) \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$, and it contradicts the condition $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$. Hence $\lambda \in \sigma(PA|_{\ker(1-P)})$. One has $\sigma(PA|_{\ker(1-P)}) = S_n$ and $\sigma((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}) \subset k\backslash S_n$. For a resolvent $\lambda \in k \subset \sigma(A)$, the equality

$$\begin{aligned}
& ((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}-(1-P)\lambda)(A-\lambda)^{-1}|_{\ker(P)} = (A-\lambda)^{-1}|_{\ker(P)}((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}-(1-P)\lambda) \\
= \ & (1-P)(A-\lambda)|_{\ker(P)}(A-\lambda)^{-1}|_{\ker(P)} = (1-P)|_{\ker(P)} = 1|_{\ker(P)} \in \mathscr{B}_k(\ker(P))
\end{aligned}$$

guarantees $\lambda \notin \sigma((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)})$. Therefore one obtains $\sigma((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}) \subset \sigma(A)\backslash S_n$. For an element $\lambda \in \sigma(A)\backslash S_n$, assume $\lambda \notin \sigma((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)})$. Since $\lambda \notin S_n = sigma(PA|_{\ker(1-P)})$ and $\lambda \notin \sigma((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)})$, one obtains $(PA|_{\ker(1-P)} - P\lambda)^{-1} \in \mathscr{B}_k(\ker(P))$ and $((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}) - (1-P)\lambda)^{-1} \in \mathscr{B}_k(\ker(1-P))$. Then one acquires

$$\begin{aligned}
& (A-\lambda)\left(P(PA|_{\ker(1-P)} - P\lambda)^{-1}P + (1-P)((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)} - (1-P)\lambda)^{-1}(1-P)\right) \\
= \; & \left(P(PA|_{\ker(1-P)} - P\lambda)^{-1}P + (1-P)((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)} - (1-P)\lambda)^{-1}(1-P)\right)(A-\lambda) \\
= \; & ((AP - \lambda P) + (A(1-P) - \lambda(1-P)) \\
& \left(P(PA|_{\ker(1-P)} - P\lambda)^{-1}P + (1-P)((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)} - (1-P)\lambda)^{-1}(1-P)\right) \\
= \; & (A-\lambda)P(PA|_{\ker(1-P)} - P\lambda)^{-1}P + (A-\lambda)(1-P)((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)} - (1-P)\lambda)^{-1}(1-P) \\
= \; & P(PA|_{\ker(1-P)} - P\lambda)(PA|_{\ker(1-P)} - P\lambda)^{-1}P \\
& +(1-P)((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)} - (1-P)\lambda)((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)} - (1-P)\lambda)^{-1}(1-P) \\
= \; & P1|_{\ker(1-P)}P + (1-P)1|_{\ker(P)}(1-P) = P^3 + (1-P)^3 = P + (1-P) = 1 \in \mathscr{B}_k(V),
\end{aligned}$$

and hence $(A-\lambda)^{-1} = P(PA|_{\ker(1-P)} - P\lambda)^{-1}P + (1-P)((1-P)|_{\ker(P)}) - (1-P)\lambda)^{-1}(1-P) \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$. It contradicts the condition $\lambda \in \sigma(A)$, and one get $\lambda \in \sigma((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)})$. Thus one has $\sigma((1-P)A|_{\ker(P)}) = \sigma(A)\backslash S_n$. ☐

The uniqueness of the continuous functional calculus is one of the most important condition for a physical quantity, and hence we assign the condition here.

Definition 7.23. *An operator $A \colon W \to V$ is said to be a k-valued normal operator if it is a closed operator admitting an extended continuous functional calculus and if an extended continuous functional calculus ι_A is independent of the choice of an analysable filtration and is unique.*

At last, one has obtained one of formulations of p-adic Quantum theory with unbounded p-adic physical quantities. This is the obvious extension of Definition 4.31.

Definition 7.24 (unbounded physical quantity)**.** *A p-adic physical quantity over k is a k-valued normal operator on a strictly Cartesian k-Banach space.*

We finished the formulation of the non-Archimedean analogue of the continuous functional calculus of an operator. A bounded p-adic physical quantity over k, Definition 4.31, is a p-adic physical quantity. The uniqueness of an extended continuous functional calculus is hard to verify in general if an operator is not bounded, and we introduce a good class of operators where the uniqueness is clearer.

Definition 7.25. *A metric space X is said to be proper if any bounded closed subset is compact.*

A proper metric space is countable at infinity as a topological space because it admits an exhaustion by closed balls of increasing radii. In particular it is σ-compact and hence Lindelöf. Moreover, it is locally compact Hausdorff. A closed subset of a proper metric space is again proper. For example, closed subsets of k^n is proper if $k = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, or if k is a local field. In particular, a spectrum of an operator on a Banach space over such a field k is proper.

Lemma 7.26. *If $\sigma \subset k$ is proper, then one has $1_S \in C_{rig}(\sigma, k)$ for any bounded clopen subset $S \subset \sigma$.*

Proof. Let I be the directed set of bounded clopen subsets of σ containing S. For pairs $(T, n), (T', n') \in I \times \mathbb{N}$, we write $(T, n) \leq (T', n')$ if $T \subset T'$ and $n \leq n'$, and then the binary relation $\leq$ on $I \times \mathbb{N}$ is a directed order. For each $(T, n) \in I \times \mathbb{N}$, since T is compact by the properness of σ, there is some continuous function $f \colon T \to k$ contained in the k-subalgebra $k[1_T z] \subset \mathrm{C}(T.\sigma)$ generated by the coordinate function $1_T z \colon T \hookrightarrow k$ such that $\|1_S - f\| < p^{-n}$ by Proposition 4.21. Since the restriction map $k[z] \to k[1_T z] \colon z \mapsto 1_T z$ is surjective, there is a pre-image $f_{T,n} \in k[z]$ whose restriction is f. Therefore by the axiom of choice, one obtains a directed system $(f_{T,n})_{(T,n) \in I \times \mathbb{N}} \in k[z]^{I \times \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{tem}}(\sigma, k)^{I \times \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\|1_S - f_{T,n}|_T\| < p^{-n}$ for any $(T, n) \in I \times \mathbb{N}$. The system converges to 1_S in $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{tem}}(\sigma, k)$ by the definition of the topology of $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{tem}}(\sigma, k)$, and hence one has $1_S \in \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma, k)$. □

Proposition 7.27. *For a closed operator $A \colon W \to V$, if the spectrum $\sigma(A) \subset k$ is proper, then an extended continuous functional calculus ι_A is unique.*

Proof. By the uniqueness of the continuous functional calculus of a bounded operator, it suffices to verify that the image $\iota_A(1_S) \in \mathrm{Cl}(V)$ is independent of the choice of an extended functional calculus for a bounded clopen subset $S \subset \sigma(A)$. Take an analysable filtration $S_0 \subset S_1 \subset \cdots \subset \sigma(A)$ and an extended continuous functional calculus ι_A associated with $S_0 \subset S_1 \subset \cdots \subset \sigma(A)$, and for a bounded clopen subset $S \subset \sigma$, we prove that $\iota_A(1_S)$ is determined by S presenting it only by S. Note that since S is compact by the properness of $\sigma(A)$, S is contained in S_N in for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and hence $\iota_A(1_S) \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ by Proposition 4.21 and the condition (v). By the proof of Lemma 7.26, there is a net $(F_i)_{i \in I} \in k[T]^I$ indexed by a directed set I such that the net $(F_i(z))_{i \in I} \in k[z]^I \subset \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(\sigma(A), k)^I$ converges to 1_S in $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{tem}}(\sigma(A), k)$. Let $W(A) \subset V$ be the intersection of the domains of operators in $k[z] \subset \mathrm{Cl}_k(V)$. Then $W(A) \subset V$ is a k-linear subspace, and is dense because it contains $\widetilde{W}$ by Lemma 7.20. Moreover, $W(A)$ contains the image of the projection $\iota_A(1_{S'})$ for any bounded clopen subset $S' \subset \sigma(A)$. Indeed, since S' is compact by the properness of $\sigma(A)$, and there is some $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $S' \subset S_M$. Therefore one has $1_{S'} \in \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{rig}}(S_M, k) = \mathrm{C}(S_M, k)$, and for an element $w \in V$ in the image of $\iota_A(1_{S'})$ and an operator $f \in k[z]$, the equality

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n,m\to\infty} \|\iota_A(1_{S_n} f)w - \iota_A(1_{S_m} f)w\| = \lim_{n,m\to\infty} \|\iota_A(1_{S_n} f)\iota_A(1_{S_M})w - \iota_A(1_{S_m} f)\iota_A(1_{S_M})w\| \\ = &\lim_{n,m\to\infty} \|\iota_A(1_{S_M} f)w - \iota_A(1_{S_M} f)w\| = 0 \end{aligned}$$

implies w is contained in the domain of f by the same argument in the proof of Lemma 7.20. Take an element $w \in W(A)$. For any positive number $\epsilon > 0$, since $\lim_{n \to \mathbb{N}} \iota_A(1_{S_n})w = w$ by the condition (iv), there is an integer $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|\iota_A(1_{S_n})w - w\| < \epsilon$ for any

$n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \leq M$. By the definition of the topology of $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{tem}}(\sigma(A), k)$, there is an index $i \in I$ such that $\|1_{S_M} F_{i'}(z) - 1_S\| = \|1_{S_M} F_{i'}(z) - 1_{S_M} 1_S\| < \epsilon$ for any $i' \in I$ with $i' \geq i$. Take an index $i' \in I$ with $i' \geq i$. By the condition (iv), there is an integer $L \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|\iota_A(1_{S_n} F_{i'}(z))w - \iota_A(F_{i'}(z))w\| < \epsilon$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq L$. In particular for an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq \max\{N, M, L\}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \|F_{i'}(A)w - \iota_A(1_S)w\| = \|\iota_A(F_{i'}(z))w - \iota_A(1_S)w\| = \|\iota_A(F_{i'}(z) - 1_{S_n} F_{i'})w + \iota_A(1_{S_n} F_{i'} - 1_S)w\| \\ \leq \ & \max\left\{\|\iota_A(F_{i'}(z) - 1_{S_n} F_{i'})w\|, \|\iota_A(1_{S_n} F_{i'} - 1_S)w\|\right\} \\ \leq \ & \max\left\{\epsilon, \|\iota_A(1_{S_n} F_{i'} - 1_S)\|\|w\|\right\} \\ = \ & \max\left\{\epsilon, \|1_{S_n} F_{i'} - 1_S\|\|w\|\right\} \\ \leq \ & \max\left\{\epsilon, \epsilon\|w\|\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence $\lim_{i \in I} F_i(A)w = \iota_A(1_S)w$. Since $W(A)$ and F_i are independent of the choice of the analysable filtration $S_0 \subset S_1 \subset \cdots \subset \sigma(A)$ and an extended continuous functional calculus ι_A, we conclude that the projection $\iota_A(1_S) \in \mathscr{B}_k(V)$ is unique. ☐

Corollary 7.28. *If k is a local field, then the extended continuous functional calculus* ι_A *of a closed operator* $A \colon W \to V$ *is unique.*

Example 7.29. *Let* x *be an operator on the strictly Cartesian* $\mathbb{Q}_p$*-Banach space* $C_0(\mathbb{Q}_p, \mathbb{Q}_p)$ *defined as the multiplication of the coordinate function* $z \colon \mathbb{Q}_p \to \mathbb{Q}_p$. *Since* $C_0(\mathbb{Q}_p, \mathbb{Q}_p)$ *admits an orthonormal Schauder basis consisting of characteristic functions on bounded clopen subsets,* x *is densely defined. Moreover, it is obvious that* x *is closed. The spectrum* $\sigma(x)$ *of* x *coincides with* $\mathbb{Q}_p$*, and one obtains the extended continuous functional calculus*

$$\iota_x \colon C_{rig}(\mathbb{Q}_p, \mathbb{Q}_p) \to Cl_{\mathbb{Q}_p}(C_0(\mathbb{Q}_p, \mathbb{Q}_p))$$

given by the multiplication. Therefore the position operator x *is a p-adic physical quantity. Note that* ι_x *has the canonical extension given by the multiplication of continuous functions which are not necessarily rigid, but such an extension is not unique.*

8 Appendix

Here we put examples and propositions referred in §1.

Example 8.1. *Let* $\mathbb{Q}_5$ *be the field of* 5*-adic numbers, which is a complete non-Archimedean field with respect to the* 5*-adic norm* $|\cdot|_5 \colon \mathbb{Q}_5 \to [0, \infty)$ *with* $|5|_5 = 5^{-1} < 1$. *For an integer* $n > 1 \in \mathbb{N}$, *endow the k-vector space* k^n *with the canonical symmetric k-bilinear inner product* $\langle \cdot \mid \cdot \rangle \colon k^n \otimes_k k^n \to k \colon \phi \otimes \psi \mapsto \langle \phi \mid \psi \rangle$ *with respect to the canonical basis, and consider the map* $\| \cdot \| \colon k^n \to [0, \infty)$ *given by setting*

$$\|f\| \coloneqq \sqrt{|\langle f \mid f \rangle|_5} = \sqrt{\left|f_1^2 + \cdots + f_n^2\right|_5}$$

for each $f = (f_1, \dots, f_n) \in k^n$. Then $(k^n, \|\cdot\|)$ is not a normed k-vector space, i.e. the map $\|\cdot\|$ does not satisfies the triangle inequality and there is a non-zero element $f \in k^n$ with $\|f\|$. Indeed there is an element $i = \cdots 431212 \in \mathbb{Q}_5$ with $i^2 = \cdots 4444 = -1 \in \mathbb{Q}_5$ and the vectors

$$f := \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, g := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ i \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, f \pm g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \pm i \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in k^n$$

satisfies

$$\|f \pm g\| = \sqrt{|1 + (-1) + 0 + \cdots + 0|_5} = 0$$

and

$$\|(f+g) + (f-g)\| = \|2f\| = |2|_5 = 1 > 0 = \|f+g\| + \|f-g\|.$$

Proposition 8.2. *If k is a discrete valuation field with a uniformiser $\pi \in k$, the symmetric inner product $\langle \cdot \mid \cdot \rangle \colon k^2 \otimes_k k^2 \to k$ given by setting*

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = 1, \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = 0,$$
$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = 0, \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \middle| \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = \pi$$

determines the norm

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \|\cdot\| \colon k^2 & \to & [0, \infty) \\ f & \mapsto & \|f\| := \sqrt{|\langle f \mid f \rangle|}, \end{array}$$

which is equivalent with the norm of the k-Banach space k^2 associated with the canonical basis.

Proof. For an element $(a, b) \in k^2$, one has

$$\|(a,b)\| = \sqrt{\left|a^2 + \pi b^2\right|} = \begin{cases} |a| & (\text{if } |a| \geq |b|) \\ |\pi|^{\frac{1}{2}} |b| & (\text{if } |a| < |b|) \end{cases} = \max\{|a|, |\pi|^{\frac{1}{2}} |b|\}$$

and hence $(k^2, \|\cdot\|)$ is a non-strict Cartesian k-Banach space admitting an orthogonal basis $(1, 0), (0, 1) \in k^2$. See [BGR] for a Cartesian normed k-vector space and an orthogonal basis. □

Proposition 8.3. *If $p \equiv 1$ [mod.4], or if $p \equiv 3$ [mod.4] and $\widetilde{k} \neq \mathbb{F}_p$, then there is a symmetric matrix $M \in M_2(k)$ such that M is not diagonalisable in an algebraic closure of k. On the other hand if $p \equiv 3$ [mod.4] and $\widetilde{k} = \mathbb{F}_p$, a symmetric matrix $M \in M_2(k)$ is diagonalisable by a unitary matrix in an unramified extension of k of dimension at most 2.*

In the proof below, we will use the relation of unitarity and orthonormality. For the precise argument, see §4.

Proof. To begin with, suppose $p \equiv 1$ [mod.4], or suppose $p \equiv 3$ [mod.4] and $\widetilde{k} \neq \mathbb{F}_p$. Then there is a square root i of -1 in k. Set

$$M := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ i & -1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{M}_2(k).$$

Then one has

$$M^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ i & -1 \end{pmatrix}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

but $M \neq 0$. Therefore the minimal polynomial of M is not reduced and M is not diagonalisable in an algebraic closure of k.

On the other hand, suppose $p \equiv 3$ [mod.4] and $\widetilde{k} = \mathbb{F}_p$. Take a symmetric matrix $M \in \mathrm{M}_2(k)$, and set

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ b & c \end{pmatrix}, \ a, b, c \in k.$$

If $a = c$ and $b = 0$, then M is a scalar matrix and hence is trivially diagonalisable by a unitary matrix. Suppose either $a \neq c$ or $b \neq 0$. The characteristic polynomial of M is $P = T^2 - (a + c)T + ac - b^2 \in k[T]$, and its roots are

$$T = \frac{a + c \pm \sqrt{(a + c)^2 - 4(ac - b^2)}}{2} = \frac{a + c \pm \sqrt{(a - c)^2 + (2b)^2}}{2} \in K := k\left(\sqrt{(a - c)^2 + (2b)^2}\right).$$

Assume $(a - c)^2 + (2b)^2 = 0$. Since either $a \neq c$ or $b \neq 0$, one has both $a \neq c$ and $b \neq 0$. It follows

$$\left(\frac{2b}{a - c}\right)^2 = -1,$$

but it contradicts the fact $\#(\widetilde{k}^\times) = \#\widetilde{k} - 1 = \#\mathbb{F}_p - 1 = p - 1 \equiv 2$ [mod.4]. Therefore $(a - c)^2 + (2b)^2 \neq 0$, and P has two distinct roots. Thus M is diagonalisable in K. The eigenvectors are

$$e_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a - c) + \sqrt{(a - c)^2 + (2b)^2} \end{pmatrix}, e_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a - c) - \sqrt{(a - c)^2 + (2b)^2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $0 < |a - c| \leq |b|$, then $\|(2b)^{-1}e_1\| = \|(2b)^{-1}e_2\| = 1$. The reductions $\overline{(2b)^{-1}e_1}, \overline{(2b)^{-1}e_2} \in \widetilde{K}^2$ are obviously linearly independent because

$$\overline{(2b)^{-1}e_1} - \overline{(2b)^{-1}e_2} = \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{a-c}{2b} + \frac{\sqrt{(a-c)^2+(2b)^2}}{2b} \end{pmatrix}} - \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{a-c}{2b} - \frac{\sqrt{(a-c)^2+(2b)^2}}{2b} \end{pmatrix}} = \overline{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{\sqrt{(a-c)^2+(2b)^2}}{2b} \end{pmatrix}} \neq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore $b^{-1}e_1, b^{-1}e_2$ are orthonormal by [BGR], 2.5.1/3. If $|a-c| > |b| > 0$, then rearranging the signature of $\sqrt{(a-c)^2+(2b)^2}$ so that $|b| = |\sqrt{(a-c)^2+(2b)^2}-(a-c)| < |\sqrt{(a-c)^2+(2b)^2}+(a-c)| = |a-c|$, one has $|(a-c)^{-1}e_1| = |b^{-1}e_2| = 1$. Indeed it is easy to show that

$$\overline{(a-c)^{-1}e_1} = \overline{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1+\frac{\sqrt{(a-c)^2+(2b)^2}}{a-c} \end{pmatrix}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{k}^2,$$

$$\overline{(2b)^{-1}e_2} = \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{(a-c)-\sqrt{(a-c)^2+(2b)^2}}{2b} \end{pmatrix}} = \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{-2b}{(a-c)+\sqrt{(a-c)^2+(2b)^2}} \end{pmatrix}} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{k}^2.$$

Obviously the reductions $\overline{(a-c)^{-1}e_1}, \overline{(2b)^{-1}e_2}$ are linearly independent, and hence $(a-c)^{-1}e_1, (2b)^{-1}e_2$ are orthonormal. We conclude that M has an orthonormal basis consists of eigenvectors, and hence is diagonalisable by a unitary matrix. ☐

Definition 8.4. *Suppose k is a discrete valuation field with mixed characteristic $(0, p)$, and fix a uniformiser $\pi \in k$. For a matrix $M \in M_2(k)$, set*

$$M^* := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \pi \end{pmatrix} {}^t M \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \pi^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \in M_2(k).$$

Obviously one has $M^{**} = M$, and hence it determines a k-linear involution $*\colon M_2(k) \to M_2(k)$. Since the characteristic of k is not 2, the k-linear representation $*$ is diagonalisable. A matrix $M \in M_2(k)$ is said to be $*$-symmetric if it is $M^* = M$, and to be $*$-antisymmetric if $M^* = -M$.

Proposition 8.5. *In the situation above, the non-Archimedean involution $*$ has the adjoint property with respect to the symmetric inner product $\langle \cdot \mid \cdot \rangle$ we have defined in Proposition 8.2. Suppose $p \neq 2$. Suppose a matrix*

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & M_2 \\ M_3 & M_4 \end{pmatrix} \in M_2(k)$$

is $*$-symmetric or $*$-antisymmetric. The matrix M is diagonalisable, and more precisely, is diagonalisable by a unitary matrix in a totally ramified extension of k of dimension at most 2 if and only if $|M_1 - M_4| \geq |M_2|$.

Proof. The adjoint property is obvious. Take a $*$-symmetric matrix $M \in \mathrm{M}_2(k)$. The equality $M = M^*$ implies that M is of the form

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ \pi b & c \end{pmatrix}, a, b, c \in k.$$

If $b = 0$, then $|M_1 - M_4| = |a-c| \geq 0 = |M_2|$ and trivially M is diagonalisable by a unitary matrix. Hence we may and do assume $b \neq 0$. The discriminant of its characteristic polynomial is $(a-c)^2 + \pi(2b)^2$, and is never 0 by the calculation in the proof of Proposition

8.2. The same holds for $M-\lambda$ for each $\lambda \in k$, and hence M is diagonalisable in the totally ramified extension $k(\sqrt{(a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2})/k$. Here we rearrange the signature of the square root $\sqrt{(a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2}$ in the following way: If $|a-c| \geq |2b| > 0$, set

$$\sqrt{(a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2} := (a-c)\left(1+\pi\left(\frac{2b}{a-c}\right)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \in k = k\left(\sqrt{(a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2)}\right),$$

and if $|a-c| \leq |2b\pi| < |2b|$, set

$$\sqrt{(a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2} := 2b\sqrt{\pi}\left(1+\left(\frac{a-c}{2b\pi}\right)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \in k\left(\sqrt{\pi}\right) = k\left(\sqrt{(a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2}\right)$$

for a fixed square root $\sqrt{\pi}$ of π. Note that the convergent radius of the analytic function $(1+z)^{1/2}$ is $1-$ because $p \neq 2$. The eigenvalues of M are

$$\lambda_\pm := \frac{a+c}{2} \pm \frac{\sqrt{(a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2}}{2},$$

and the corresponding eigenvectors are

$$f_+ := \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c)-\sqrt{(a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2} \end{pmatrix}, f_- := \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c)+\sqrt{(a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2} \end{pmatrix} \in k^2.$$

We repeat the totally same process of the proof of Proposition 8.3. To begin with, suppose $|a-c| \geq |2b| > 0$. Then $|M_1 - M_4| \geq |M_2|$. Take the integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|(a-c)\pi^n| = |2b|$ and set $u := 2b/(a-c)\pi^n \in k^\times$. One has

$$\begin{aligned} f_+ &= \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c)-\sqrt{(a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c)\left(1-\left(1+\pi\left(\frac{2b}{a-c}\right)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (a-c)\pi^n \begin{pmatrix} -u \\ 1-\left(1+u^2\pi^{2n+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \\ f_- &= \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c)+\sqrt{(a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ \frac{(a-c)^2-((a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2}{(a-c)-\sqrt{(a-c)^2+\pi(2b)^2}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ \frac{-\pi(2b)^2}{(a-c)\left(1-\left(1+\pi\left(\frac{2b}{a-c}\right)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= 2b\pi^{-n} \begin{pmatrix} -\pi^n \\ \frac{u\pi^{2n+1}}{\left(1-\left(1+u^2\pi^{2n+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\|((a-c)\pi^n)^{-1} f_+\| = \|(2b\pi^{-n})^{-1} f_-\| = 1$ and

$$\overline{((a-c)\pi^n)^{-1} f_+} = \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -u \\ 1-\left(1+u^2\pi^{2n+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\overline{u} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{k}^2,$$

$$\overline{(2b\pi^{-n})^{-1} f_-} = \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -\pi^n \\ \frac{u\pi^{2n+1}}{\left(1-\left(1+u^2\pi^{2n+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)} \end{pmatrix}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \overline{\frac{u\pi^{2n+1}}{\left(1-\left(1+\left(\frac{2b}{(a-c)\pi^n}\pi^n\right)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}} \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{k}^2.$$

It follows that $\overline{((a-c)\pi^n)^{-1} f_+}$ and $\overline{(2b)^{-1} f_-}$ are linearly independent, and hence $((a-c)\pi^n)^{-1} f_+$ and $(2b\pi^{-n})^{-1} f_-$ are orthonormal by [BGR], 2.5.1/3. Since M admits an orthonormal basis consisting of eigenvectors, M is diagonalisable by a unitary matrix in a suitable field.

On the other hand, suppose $|a-c| \leq |2b\pi| < |2b|$. Then $|M_1 - M_4| < |M_2|$ and one has

$$\begin{aligned} f_+ &= \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c) - \sqrt{(a-c)^2 + \pi(2b)^2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c) - 2b\sqrt{\pi}\left(1 + \left(\frac{a-c}{2b\pi}\right)^2\right) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= 2b \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{a-c}{2b\pi}\pi - \left(1 + \left(\frac{a-c}{2b\pi}\right)^2\right)\sqrt{\pi} \end{pmatrix}, \\ f_- &= \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c) + \sqrt{(a-c)^2 + \pi(2b)^2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c) + 2b\sqrt{\pi}\left(1 + \left(\frac{a-c}{2b\pi}\right)^2\right) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= 2b \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{a-c}{2b\pi}\pi + \left(1 + \left(\frac{a-c}{2b\pi}\right)^2\right)\sqrt{\pi} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\|(2b)^{-1} f_\pm\| = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{(2b)^{-1} f_+} &= \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{a-c}{2b\pi}\pi - \left(1 + \left(\frac{a-c}{2b\pi}\right)^2\right)\sqrt{\pi} \end{pmatrix}} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{k}^2, \\ \overline{(2b)^{-1} f_-} &= \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{a-c}{2b\pi}\pi + \left(1 + \left(\frac{a-c}{2b\pi}\right)^2\right)\sqrt{\pi} \end{pmatrix}} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \overline{(2b)^{-1} f_+} \in \widetilde{k}^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows

$$\|f_+ - f_-\| = |2b| \|(2b)^{-1} f_+ - (2b)^{-1} f_-\| < |2b| = \max\{\|f_+\|, \|f_-\|\}$$

and hence f_+ and f_- are not orthogonal. Since M does not admit an orthogonal basis consisting of eigenvectors, M is not diagonalisable by a unitary matrix. □

The involution above is non-canonical because we used the adjoint property of a non-canonical symmetric inner product $\langle \cdot \mid \cdot \rangle$. The same construction of a non-canonical involution works for other non-canonical inner product. Here is another example.

Definition 8.6. *Suppose* $p \equiv 3$ $[mod.4]$ *and* $\widetilde{k} = \mathbb{F}_p$. *Let* K/k *be the unramified Galois extension* $k[X]/(X^2+1)$ *and* $i \in K$ *the image of* $X \in k[X]$ *the canonical projection* $k[X] \to K$. *Denote by* $g \colon K \to K$ *the unique non-trivial element. For a matrix* $M \in M_2(K)$, *set*

$$M^* := {}^t M^g \in M_2(K),$$

where the action of g on $M_2(K)$ is given through the action on the entries. Obviously one has $M^{**} = M$, and hence it determines a k-linear involution $*\colon M_2(K) \to M_2(K)$. Since the characteristic of k is not 2, the k-linear representation $*$ is diagonalisable. A matrix $M \in M_2(K)$ is said to be $*$-symmetric if it is $M^* = M$, and to be $*$-antisymmetric if $M^* = -M$.

Proposition 8.7. *In the situation above, a matrix $M \in M_2(K)$ which is $*$-symmetric or $*$-antisymmetric is diagonalisable by a unitary matrix in an unramified extension of K of dimension at most* 2.

Proof. Take a matrix $M \in \mathrm{M}_2(K)$ which is $*$-symmetric or $*$-antisymmetric. If M is $*$-antisymmetric, then iM is $*$-symmetric, and hence we may and do assume M is $*$-symmetric. The equality $M^* = M$ implies that M is a matrix of the form

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ b^g & c \end{pmatrix}, a, c \in k, b \in K.$$

If $b = 0$, then trivially M is diagonalisable by a unitary matrix, and hence we may and do assume $b \neq 0$. The discriminant of the characteristic polynomial of M is $(a-c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)$, where $N_{K/k}\colon K \to k$ is the norm map given by setting $N_{K/k}(f) = f^g f \in k$ for each $f \in K$. One has the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \widetilde{K}^\times \times (1 + K^{\circ\circ}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & K^\times \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & |K^\times| \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \widetilde{k}^\times \times (1 + k^{\circ\circ}) \arrow[r] & k^\times \arrow[r] & |k^\times| \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

whose columns are exact sequences given by the multiplicative valuation $|\cdot|\colon K^\times \to \mathbb{R}^\times$ and the Teichmüller embedding $\widetilde{K}^\times \to K^\times$ and whose rows are given by the norm maps. Note that even if the valuation of k is not discrete and even if one does not fixes a lift of the Frobenius, the Teichmüller embedding works in the canonical way because the residue fields are finite. They consists of 0 and roots of unity. The elementary number theory and the assumption $\widetilde{k} = \mathbb{F}_p$ imply the image of the norm map $\widetilde{K}^\times \to \widetilde{k}^\times$ is the subgroup $(\mathbb{F}_p^\times)^2 \subset \mathbb{F}_p^\times$, and the restriction $1 + K^{\circ\circ} \to 1 + k^{\circ\circ}$ of the norm map is surjective because the convergent radius of the square root function $(1+z)^{1/2}$ is $1-$. Therefore the image of the first row is $(\widetilde{k}^\times)^2 \times 1 + k^{\circ\circ}$. Be careful that in this proof, for a multiplicative Abelian group G, we denote by G^2 the subgroup of G consisting of square elements but not the direct product $G \times G$. The image of the third row is $|K^\times|^2 = |k^\times|^2 \subset |k^\times|$ because the extension K/k is unramified, and hence the image $N_{K/k}(K^\times)$ of the second row satisfies that the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \left(\widetilde{k}^\times\right)^2 \times (1 + k^{\circ\circ}) \longrightarrow N_{K/k}(K^\times) \to |k^\times|^2 \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact by the snake lemma. Considering the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \left(\widetilde{k}^{\times} \times (1 + k^{\circ\circ})\right)^2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & (k^{\times})^2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & |k^{\times}|^2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \left(\widetilde{k}^{\times}\right)^2 \times (1 + k^{\circ\circ}) \arrow[r] & N_{K/k}(K^{\times}) \arrow[r] & |k^{\times}|^2 \arrow[r] & 0,
\end{tikzcd}$$

one has $N_{K/k}(K^{\times}) = (k^{\times})^2$. In particular, the discriminant $(a - c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)$ is contained in $(k^{\times})^2 + (k^{\times})^2 := \{f_1^2 + f_2^2 \mid f_1, f_2 \in k\} \subset k$, and the subset does not contains $0 \in k$ by the proof of Proposition 8.3. It follows that the discriminant is never 0. The same holds for $M - \lambda$ for any $\lambda \in k$, and hence M is diagonalisable in the unramified extension $K(\sqrt{(a - c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)})/K$. The eigenvalues of M are

$$\lambda_{\pm} := \frac{a + c}{2} \pm \frac{\sqrt{(a - c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)}}{2}$$

and the corresponding eigenvectors are

$$f_{+} := \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a - c) - \sqrt{(a - c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)} \end{pmatrix}, f_{-} := \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a - c) + \sqrt{(a - c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)} \end{pmatrix} \in k^2.$$

We repeat the totally same process of the proofs of Proposition 8.3 and Proposition 8.5. First, suppose $|a - c| > |2b| > 0$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_{+}$ be the integer with $|(a - c)\pi^{n+1}| = |2b|$ and set $u := 4N_{K/k}(b)/(a - c)^2\pi^{2n+2} \in k^{\times}$. Here we rearrange the signature of the square root $\sqrt{(a - c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)}$ in the following way:

$$\sqrt{(a - c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)} := (a - c)\left(1 + u\pi^{2n+2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \in k = k\left(\sqrt{(a - c)^2 + \pi(2b)^2}\right).$$

One has

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{+} &= \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a - c) - \sqrt{(a - c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a - c)\left(1 - \left(1 + N_{K/k}(u)\pi^{2n+2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \end{pmatrix} \\
&= (a - c)\pi^{n+1} \begin{pmatrix} -u \\ \frac{\left(1 - \left(1 + N_{K/k}(u)\pi^{2n+2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}{\pi^{2n+2}}\pi^{n+1} \end{pmatrix}, \\
f_{-} &= \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a - c) + \sqrt{(a - c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ \frac{(a-c)^2 - ((a-c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b))}{(a-c) - \sqrt{(a-c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ \frac{-4N_{K/k}(b)}{(a-c)\left(1 - \left(1 + u\pi^{2n+2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= (a - c) \begin{pmatrix} -u\pi^{n+1} \\ \frac{-N_{K/k}(u)\pi^{2n+2}}{\left(1 - \left(1 + u\pi^{2n+2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)} \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\|((a - c)\pi^{n+1})^{-1} f_{+}\| = \|(a - c) f_{-}\| = 1$ and

$$\overline{((a - c)\pi^{n+1})^{-1} f_{+}} = \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -u \\ \frac{\left(1 - \left(1 + N_{K/k}(u)\pi^{2n+2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}{\pi^{2n+2}}\pi^{n+1} \end{pmatrix}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\overline{u} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{k}^2,$$

$$\overline{(a-c)^{-1}f_-} \;=\; \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -u\pi^{n+1} \\ \frac{-N_{K/k}(u)\pi^{2n+2}}{\left(1-\left(1+u\pi^{2n+2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)} \end{pmatrix}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \overline{\frac{-N_{K/k}(u)\pi^{2n+2}}{\left(1-\left(1+u\pi^{2n+2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}} \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{k}^2.$$

It follows that $\overline{((a-c)\pi^{n+1})^{-1}f_+}$ and $\overline{(a-c)^{-1}f_-}$ are linearly independent and hence $((a-c)\pi^{n+1})^{-1}f_+$ and $(a-c)^{-1}f_-$ are orthonormal by [BGR], 2.5.1/3. Since M admits an orthonormal basis consisting of eigenvectors, M is diagonalisable by a unitary matrix in a suitable field.

Secondly, suppose $0 < |a-c| < |2b|$. One has

$$\begin{aligned} f_+ &= \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c) - \sqrt{(a-c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)} \end{pmatrix} = 2b\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{a-c}{2b} - \frac{\sqrt{(a-c)^2+4N_{K/k}(b)}}{2b} \end{pmatrix}, \\ f_- &= \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c) + \sqrt{(a-c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)} \end{pmatrix} = 2b\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{a-c}{2b} + \frac{\sqrt{(a-c)^2+4N_{K/k}(b)}}{2b} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\|(2b)^{-1}f_+\| = \|(2b)^{-1}f_-\| = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{(2b)^{-1}f_+} &= \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{a-c}{2b} - \frac{\sqrt{(a-c)^2+4N_{K/k}(b)}}{2b} \end{pmatrix}} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \overline{-\frac{\sqrt{(a-c)^2+4N_{K/k}(b)}}{2b}} \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{k}^2, \\ \overline{(2b)^{-1}f_-} &= \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -1\pi^{n+1} \\ \frac{a-c}{2b} + \frac{\sqrt{(a-c)^2+4N_{K/k}(b)}}{2b} \end{pmatrix}} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \overline{\frac{\sqrt{(a-c)^2+4N_{K/k}(b)}}{2b}} \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{k}^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\overline{(2b)^{-1}f_+}$ and $\overline{(2b)^{-1}f_-}$ are linearly independent and hence $(2b)^{-1}f_+$ and $(2b)^{-1}f_-$ are orthonormal by [BGR], 2.5.1/3. Since M admits an orthonormal basis consisting of eigenvectors, M is diagonalisable by a unitary matrix in a suitable field.

Finally, suppose $|a-c| = |2b| > 0$. Set $u := 2b/(a-c)$ and $v := (a-c)^{-1}\sqrt{(a-c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)}$. One has

$$\begin{aligned} f_+ &= \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c) - \sqrt{(a-c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)} \end{pmatrix} = (a-c)\begin{pmatrix} -u \\ 1-v \end{pmatrix}, \\ f_- &= \begin{pmatrix} -2b \\ (a-c) + \sqrt{(a-c)^2 + 4N_{K/k}(b)} \end{pmatrix} = (a-c)\begin{pmatrix} -u \\ 1+v \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\|(a-c)^{-1}f_+\| = \|(a-c)^{-1}f_-\| = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{(a-c)^{-1}f_+} &= \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -u \\ 1-v \end{pmatrix}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\overline{u} \\ 1-\overline{v} \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{k}^2, \\ \overline{(a-c)^{-1}f_-} &= \overline{\begin{pmatrix} -u \\ 1+v \end{pmatrix}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\overline{u} \\ 1+\overline{v} \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{k}^2 \end{aligned}$$

with $\overline{u} \neq 0$ and $\overline{v} \neq 0$. It follows that $\overline{(a-c)^{-1}f_+}$ and $\overline{(a-c)^{-1}f_-}$ are linearly independent and hence $(a-c)^{-1}f_+$ and $(a-c)^{-1}f_-$ are orthonormal by [BGR], 2.5.1/3. Since M admits an orthonormal basis consisting of eigenvectors, M is diagonalisable by a unitary matrix in a suitable field. □

Acknowledgements

I am dearly grateful to Professor T. Tsuji for his daily advices from various aspects. I owe the accomplishment of this paper entirely to him. I am also greatly thankful to Professor Anatory N. Kochubei. I would like to appreciate having helpful personal discussions. I am deeply obliged to my friends for their helps. I am overwhelmed with gratitude to my family for much affection.

References

[AD] Dodzi Attimu, Toka Diagana, *Functional Calculus for a Class of Unbounded Linear Operators on Some non-Archimedean Banach Spaces*, Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 50, No. 1, p. 37-60, 2009

[Ber] Vladimir G. Berkovich, *Spectral Theory and Analytic Geometry over non-Archimedean Fields*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, number 33, the American Mathematical Society, 1990

[BGR] S. Bosch, U. Güntzer, and R. Remmert, *Non-Archimedean Analysis A Systematic Approach to Rigid Analytic Geometry*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 261, A Series of Comprehensive Studies in Mathematics, Springer, 1984

[Bou] Nicolas Bourbaki, *Espaces Vectoriels Topologiques*, Eléments de mathématique, vol. V, Hermann, 1953

[Die] Jean Dieudonné, *Sur les Fonctions Continues p-adiques*, Bulletin des Sciences Mathematiques, Volume 68, p. 79-95, 1944

[Dou] Ronald G. Douglas, *Banach Algebra Techniques in Operator Theory*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Volume 49, Academic Press, 1972

[Esc] Alain Escassut, *Ultrametric Banach Algebras*, World Scientific Publishing Company, 2003

[Kap] Irving Kaplansky, *The Weierstrass Theorem in Fields with Valuations*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, Volume 1, p. 356-357, 1950

[Koc1] Anatoly N. Kochubei, *Non-Archimedean Normal Operators*, Jounal of Mathematical Physics, Volume 51, 2010

[Koc2] Anatoly N. Kochubei, *On Some Classes of Non-Archimedean Operator Algebras*, preprint

[Mur1] Gerard J. Murphy, *Commutative non-Archimedean C^*-Algebras*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics, Volume 78, Number 2, p. 433-446, 1978

[Mur2] Gerard J. Murphy, *C^*-Algebras and Operator Theory*, Academic Press, 1992

[Shn] Lev Genrikhovich Shnirel'man, *Sur les Fonctions dans les Corps Normés et Algébriquement Fermés*, Izvestiya Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk SSSR Seriya Matematicheskaya, 2:5-6, p. 487-498, 1938

[Vis] Mikhail M. Vishik, *Nonarchimedean Spectral Theory*, Journal of Soviet Mathematics, Volume 30, p. 2513-2555, 1985